DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 815 EA 022 353

AUTHOR Frazier, Calvin M.
TITLE An Analysis of a Social Experiment: School-University Partnerships in 1988. Occasional Paper No. 6.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 94p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; Educational Cooperation; Educational Innovation; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *Networks; Program Development; Program Evaluation; *School Districts; *School Restructuring; Shared Resources and Services
IDENTIFIERS *National Network for Educational Renewal

ABSTRACT

An assessment of 14 school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) is provided with a focus on achievement of partnership goals. Partnership goals include simultaneous school improvement and educator education. Methodology involved site observation and interviews with 126 school district and university personnel and 24 key outside individuals who were administrators or policymakers on the state or national levels. Partnerships were evaluated according to internalization of network goals, agenda setting, and operational issues. Findings indicate that six partnerships reflect network goals and that eight do not. The final two chapters discuss national educational trends and the future of the partnership concept. Appendices include a list of partnerships and the study questionnare. (20 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324815

Center for Educational Renewal

AN ANALYSIS OF A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS IN 1988

CALVIN M. FRAZIER

Occasional Paper No. 6

September 1988

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. I. Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

EA 022 353

AN ANALYSIS OF A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS IN 1988

CALVIN M. FRAZIER

Occasional Paper No. 6

September 1988

CONTENTS

PREFACE BY JOHN. I. GOODLAD i

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER ONE — CREATION OF THE NATIONAL NETWORK: A GENERAL OVERVIEW OF A 'RATHER DEVIANT IDEA' 3

CHAPTER TWO — THE STUDY 8

CHAPTER THREE — MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY 12

CHAPTER FOUR — NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS 60

CHAPTER FIVE — THE PARTNERSHIP CONCEPT AND THE EDUCATIONAL REFORM OF 1988 67

APPENDIX A — LISTING OF PARTNERSHIPS 79

APPENDIX B — STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE 81

END NOTES 83

PREFACE

Nearing completion of the research underlying the book, A Place Called School, my colleagues and I concluded that teaching in schools would not improve markedly until exemplary sites are available for teacher education purposes. We assume that such sites are more likely to be realized when practitioners and researchers join in their creation. Cynics are likely to treat this assumption with the response, "And this union is likely to occur at about the same time cows learn to fly."

This cynical view is likely to be bolstered through reading No. 2 of our Center for Educational Renewal Occasional Paper Series. It is a comprehensive review, by Richard Clark, of the literature on partnerships and networks involving school-university collaboration. Clark's conclusions are rather bleak. In his judgment, only two of the settings he was able to identify involved anything resembling a close and reasonably intense collaboration. The difficulties in bringing together these two quite different cultures are many and substantial. Clark identified commitment as the necessary first ingredient for success.

And yet, it is surprising that the two first levels, elementary and secondary, of our three-tiered educational system do not work more closely with the third, higher level. After all, colleges and universities produce the teachers for schools and school districts are the clients. The gap between the two types of institutions appears to be greater today than it was a decade or two ago.

In spite of this history of limited collaboration, deliberate joining of the two appeared to me to be not only desirable but essential to the future educational health of our communities. Building on earlier efforts to effect modest collaborations (described in Occasional Paper No. 1 of this Series), I invited more than a dozen school superintendents in Southern California to explore the advantages of joining their school districts with UCLA in a process of dialogue and educational improvement. Out of this overture emerged the Southern California Partnership. An expression of interest from Brigham Young University led to the BYU-School District Partnership. In the year following publication of A Nation At Risk (1983), several administrators from school districts in the

Greater Seattle area approached personnel in the College of Education, University of Washington, for purposes of developing a proactive stance to school reform. As a result, the Puget Sound Educational Consortium was formed in the summer of 1986.

Two colleagues and I created the Center for Educational Renewal in early fall 1985. One of its major purposes was to develop school-university partnerships as a strategy for simultaneously improving schools and the education of educators. Requests for information and, indeed, for some kind of affiliation with our activities came to us almost immediately. In April 1986, Education Week announced the launching of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) with a membership of ten school-university partnerships. By April 1987, the NNER was comprised of fourteen such partnerships in as many states. Other school-university collaborations seeking membership were put on hold.

From the beginning, we have viewed the venture as a "social experiment." There are no tested models to guide us. The conceptual underpinnings--extrapolated from earlier, less ambitious programs of educational improvement--cannot possibly take into account all of the difficulties likely to be encountered along the way. At the core of difficulty is the age-old tension between specification of goals and activities, on one hand, and flexibility and freedom of choice, on the other.

Social experiments have a moral dimension in that they necessarily entail the hopes, energy, and time of the participants. The NNER embraces fourteen school-university partnerships which, in turn, include 115 school districts and sixteen universities. We have not attempted to count the number of schools and individuals. The initial commitment is for five years, 1985-1990. However, four of the partnerships came into existence in 1987 and one in 1988. Nonetheless, the year 1988 represents a mid-point in the projected five-year period for about half of the partnerships. Consequently, it appeared to me to be essential that we take stock of the enterprise.

Thanks to a grant from the Hewlett Foundation, we were able to secure the services of Dr. Calvin Frazier who had recently left the post of Commissioner of Education for the State of Colorado. There were several reasons for this choice. First, Frazier's work over the years has brought him into close communication with both schools and universities and, of

course, with policy makers. Second, he promoted the so-called "clusters" program in Colorado which encouraged teacher preparing institutions to collaborate for several purposes with a cluster of nearby schools. Third, Calvin Frazier is one of those rare individuals who is equally at ease in "high places" or a rural school. Consequently, he quickly puts others at ease--a necessary trait for candidly and successfully interviewing a wide range of people.

The central charge to Frazier was to determine, to the degree possible, how well the school-university concepts were unfolding in the fourteen partnerships comprising the NNER: successes, failures, problems, etc. In effect, he was to provide a formative evaluation of the usefulness of school-university partnerships as an educational improvement strategy. He was not asked to evaluate individual partnerships.

As Frazier points out, it was not easy to separate the general from the particular, especially since the experience of individual partnerships provided the source material for generalizations. Also, those interviewed could speak only of their association with and knowledge of a particular partnership. Further, some of the principal actors were far more interested in getting feedback regarding Frazier's views on their own partnership and much less interested in the overall picture.

My colleagues and I in the Center for Educational Renewal were and are more interested in Frazier's observations on the enterprise as a whole and their implications for school-university partnerships generally. First, we want to encourage whatever midstream changes are likely to increase achievement of overall goals and individual partnership accomplishments. Second, we feel a deep obligation to report to the public and the educational community on the usefulness and limitations of this kind of social experiment. This is particularly important at a time when partnerships are the "in" thing and, like all "in" things, are viewed uncritically as the answer to complex issues. The grant from the Hewlett Foundation is predicated on our commitment to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the concepts and their implementation. Our book, School-University Partnerships in Action (edited by Sirotnik and Goodlad, 1988), and this Occasional Paper by Calvin Frazier constitute steps along the way toward an evaluative report to be prepared two or three years from now.

We have a third reason for our deep interest in how the conceptual underpinnings are playing out in the network of partnerships and in the revisions suggested by the process to date. The overall goal is to simultaneously improve schooling and the education of educators. We do not see how this can be done if schools and universities continue to remain as uncoupled as they generally are now. The question for us is not whether the two sets of institutions should collaborate closely, but how.

Currently, we are three years into a comprehensive study of the education of educators for the schools. Numbers 1 and 2 in our new Technical Report Series, soon to begin, describe the purposes, concepts, and methods of the study. Our conclusions and recommendations for redesigning the education of teachers and principals will be published in late summer or early fall 1990, if we remain on schedule. For these recommendations to be implemented successfully, there must be a close working relationship of a symbiotic or organic nature between teacher preparing institutions and schools used for teacher education purposes. What is learned from the social experiment represented by the school-university partnerships in the NNER should be of great value not only in our own work after 1990 but also for others interested in improving the education of educators.

Calvin Frazier's insights, as reported on subsequent pages, take on great significance, then, not only for the Center's work but also for the individual partnerships. Undoubtedly, there will be disagreement as to whether Frazier "got it right." Whether he did or not is important but not as important as whether or not his report leads to reflection, affirmation or re-affirmation of goals, and improvement on the part of partnership members and the NNER. Also of great importance is the degree to which people in settings contemplating school-university partnerships take heed and think carefully about directions and programs.

Frazier admits to some intellectual biases regarding educational improvement and the limitations in both his sample of interviewees and the time spent at each setting. His report is not intended to be "the truth" regarding either the underlying concepts or the situation of each partnership at the time he visited it. Another report, guided by a different perspective on educational improvement, using other methods, undoubtedly would produce some different conclusions. Frazier's report should be

viewed from the perspective of what it is--a serious effort to provide useful information and observations about work in progress so that this work might become more effective.

Calvin Frazier and I have discussed three factors in particular that readers should keep in mind. First, although leadership people in all partnerships were asked to consider carefully the conditions and agenda set forth in the mission statement sent to them, it is obvious that some pursued them casually. They were motivated, apparently, to join the NNER for reasons other than close identification with the mission statement. Frazier urges those in the less-committed partnerships to re-think the desirability of continuing. There is, I believe, great need for the kind of introspection implied. Close collaboration between schools and universities is difficult at best. Without strong commitments to a common agenda, failure is assured.

Second, Frazier looked at the partnerships as he found them, not at their history. Several had been in existence for little more than a year at the time of his visit. Several had at least goals and organizational arrangements in place when the NNER came into existence. One already had functioned for several years as a consortium of schools and continued as such after joining. Although the correlation is not perfect, those with the longest history as school-university partnerships or consortia are those identified by Frazier as the most mature. He notes the possibility of several of the others maturing in like fashion with the passage of time. This in no way reduces the urgency of his overall recommendations, however.

Third, although the National Network for Educational Renewal has received considerable attention as a promising "national" program in educational improvement, its financial resources in no way match what might be assumed. Indeed, they are so limited and so uncertain as to constitute <u>the</u> major reason why the entire social experiment may fail. The time of the small core staff of the Center for Educational Renewal is now devoted almost entirely to the Study of the Education of Educators briefly mentioned above. Three coordinators, serving as consultants and employed elsewhere, provide almost all of the limited technical assistance made available. In effect, each partnership is "a tub on its own bottom," left to interpret the mission statement in its own way.

Calvin Frazier notes the observation put forward by Kenneth Sirotnik and me regarding the deviant nature of the school-university concept. The absence of money as a motivator may be one of the most deviant aspects of this deviant concept (and one we would prefer to be rectified). Member partnerships "bought" into the NNER on the basis of an appealing concept--or for the inappropriate reasons identified by Frazier early in his paper. They did not come in to secure resources; nor did they pay a fee. Is it possible today for ideas to be sufficient motivation for the serious, difficult business of improving educational programs?

I believe strongly that not offering money to "buy" people into the goals of the NNER is a strength. On the other hand, the disparity between the image of significance, as portrayed in many quarters, and the paltry financial resources now available to run the enterprise is discouraging. I am convinced that most of the partnerships would be much further along today if we had been able to employ just one full-time person to nurture them. I cannot think of one major educational improvement initiative that has prospered without a full-time staff and reasonably stable financial resources. Should the social experiment be less than successful, we may not know the degree to which adequate funding might have made the difference.

My colleagues and I are deeply grateful to Calvin Frazier for going beyond the initial charge in providing us with such a useful report. We would be remiss in not expressing our appreciation to the Hewlett Foundation which provided the necessary funds.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director
Center for Educational Renewal
October 1988

AN ANALYSIS OF A SOCIAL EXPERIMENT: SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS IN 1988

INTRODUCTION

In gathering the data for this study, I often felt that I was asking questions about educational relationships and governance issues but recording responses and observations that took on the flavor of a sociological analysis. When I began the planning for this study in the Fall of 1987, the directions given me were relatively simple. John I. Goodlad, Director of the Center for Educational Renewal, asked me to visit each of the fourteen school-university partnership sites in the National Network for Educational Renewal and gather information as to their progress in achieving the goals underpinning the partnership concept. The partnerships were created to bring school districts and their schools into a relationship with universities for the purpose of simultaneously improving schooling and the education of educators. But there was something deeper.

Goodlad occasionally uses the words, "social experiment", to indicate the depth and complexity of the partnership concept. As the study progressed, I realized the accuracy of this description. Creating an effective and successful school-university partnership is not so much dependent on the participants' educational knowledge base, but rather on their understanding of institutional roles, social interactions within an organization, the dynamics of change, and shifts in our American social and political structure that make change in our institutions a far different process than it might have been a few decades ago.

Respondents wanted to talk about their partnership efforts. They also wanted me to know what was happening to them personally, and, in some cases, the difficulty of making the implementation of the partnership a major focus in their daily lives. Motivation became a critical part of the study. One needed to know why an individual chose to participate, sustain, and value a partnership. Or, conversely, it was

important to determine why these feelings of support failed to develop.[1]

There were broader issues. The efforts to establish partnerships in the fourteen states have competed with economic slowdowns, violence and drug related issues, bargaining conflicts, racial and equity concerns, and a growing tendency on the part of lawmakers to take decision making out of the hands of educational leaders and governing boards. Currently, our society provides an unfriendly environment for much of the educational community. Assessing the degree of change achieved by a concept as challenging as that advanced by Goodlad has to be considered in the context in which such a major effort was launched.

Goodlad has argued that the school-university partnership is an idea whose time has come (1). I support this belief, but, unfortunately, many complicating societal demands and pressures have arrived at the same time the partnerships were being founded. The report, A Nation at Risk (2), and other task force and commission documents carried us into the first wave of reform that spoke to approaches very different than those anticipated in the partnership concept. But even while this study was being conducted, events were moving to enhance the partnership concept in a way that was not true three years earlier. Frustrations over the early reform efforts have stimulated a search for alternatives to statutory mandates. The final two chapters of the study examine the partnership concept in light of these emerging trends. I hope the addition of these two chapters adds a strength to the report and does not in any way detract from the original purpose of assessing the progress made by the fourteen pioneers of a "social experiment."

---

* Readers are advised to read another in this series of papers for a historical review of the limited degree to which schools and universities have worked successfully together. See Richard W. Clark, School/University Relations: Partnerships and Networks. Occasional Paper No. 2, Center for Educational Renewal, College of Education, Seattle, WA: University of Washington, 1986.

Chapter One
CREATION OF THE NATIONAL NETWORK:
A General Overview of a 'Rather Deviant Idea'

The establishment of a National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER) and the bringing together of fourteen school-university partnerships in such a Network occurred just over two years ago*, having been officially noted in *Education Week* in April 1986 (3, p.1,16). The genesis of the partnership and networking concepts, however, had been in development and refinement for several decades. For John I. Goodlad, the founder of the Network and the one most responsible for bringing the fourteen partnerships into a loose, networking relationship for purposes of studying this phenomenon (4), the concept represents a lifetime of study and testing of the conceptual components he believes to be core principles for a successful partnership. Since Goodlad publications have dominated educational bookshelves for the past thirty years, his advocacy of this idea has done more to encourage its adoption than any other stimulus.

Indeed, when pursuing reasons for the establishment of a partnership in a state and why people sought membership, many participants said something similar to one respondent:

> Sure I wanted to be included with California, Utah, and Washington when I heard other states might be added to the Network. I didn't know that much about the idea, but I thought it was probably a good thing if John Goodlad had his name on it.

It was this confidence and respect for an individual that brought about an expansion of the concept in a relatively short time span of less than three years. Most persons interviewed knew Goodlad had been involved for years in school-university, collaborative efforts. Out of

---

* Ten school-university partnerships were announced at this time. Four more came into existence and joined the NNER during the following year. The partnerships differ, then, in age and experience.

their admiration for the individual, they quite often did not probe the concept, but readily signed on to participate. Ironically, this esteem may have contributed to some of the early floundering by the partnerships.

The inception of Goodlad's partnership concept began after World War II as he worked during the period from 1947 to 1956 in a collaborative program involving six colleges and universities with six school districts in the Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service plan. This experience and subsequent involvements in the Englewood Project in Sarasota, Florida, the League of Cooperating Schools in Southern California, extensive work at Brigham Young University and the University of Washington, and finally his landmark Study of Schooling and the publication of A Place Called School (5) provide a forty-year evolvement to the learnings undergirding the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). Details of this unfolding can be read in Chapter One of the 1988 Sirotnik and Goodlad publication, School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (6).

The National Network (NNER) itself, with headquarters at the University of Washington in Seattle, is in its infancy. Conceived as a connection to expedite the transfer of information and ideas between the partners, its contribution rests in large part on having something of value to transfer. Until the partnerships themselves move to the establishment of significant activities, much of the early work of the Network has been in holding organization meetings, providing technical assistance to the individual sites through three regional consultants, and making the leadership of the Director available for some of the preliminary orientation sessions for prospective member districts.

Some Network conferences such as the Tents-by-the-Sea meeting held in the summer of 1987 (7), have focused on sharing the variety of difficulties encountered in inaugurating the partnership concept and the importance of documenting the progress and frustrations. In the interviews, the writer found a great deal of ambivalence among the partnership directors on the value of the agenda topics and the usefulness of the meetings held to date. All agreed, however, that the concept of a network to reinforce the partnership directors was vital.

The contacts and friendships developing among the directors were reported as being particularly beneficial, and these relationships have

lead to a sharing apart from the formal sessions. **Maine** and **California** moved an additional step by having nine teachers participate in an exchange between elementary schools in the two partnerships (8). The concept of a critical mass of innovators meeting and exchanging information appears to be a valid strategy for moving the partnerships ahead. The NNER was not the primary focus of this study, but at this point it must be said that the NNER is not seen by the majority of the directors as a powerful core of support. Goodlad and his colleagues do not view themselves as responsible for the functioning of individual partnerships. Nor do partnership directors see themselves as driven by the Center for Educational Renewal. Perhaps these relationships are as they should be. Currently, the relationships are being re-thought. Chapter Three may require the development of a different set of NNER activities than has been utilized in the past.

In regard to providing an overview of the partnership concept itself, there are at least two major differences between the Goodlad Partnership Concept and the many others that are appearing on a regular basis. Since partnerships are the "in" thing currently (9, p.78), numerous collaborative endeavors have been organized. None of the other school-university partnership arrangements reviewed by the writer or discussed by various study respondents has the conceptual structure, the base of experience related to that framework, and the comprehensive agenda that Goodlad is proposing. Most of the other partnerships identified lack such an extensive theoretical base and focus on a very limited agenda.

A second major difference should be noted. Developing with the refinement of the conceptual base was a growing personal discouragement that must be recognized for its contribution to the framing of the partnership concept. Goodlad writes:

> During the decade of the 1970s - a decade dismally devoid of educational ideas - I became increasingly depressed over the noneducational agendas of educational leaders. (5, p. 353)

From a concern for a void in leadership in education, he moved to a

deeper sense of alarm in terms of what he now perceives to be a more serious threat. In opening the report on schooling in America, A Place Called School, he summarizes this anxiety:

> American schools are in trouble. In fact, the problems of schooling are of such crippling proportions that many schools may not survive. It is possible that our entire public education system is nearing collapse. (5, p.1)

The partnerships are seen as one potential redirection of this scenario. Goodlad believes that one of the few chances for reversing this situation is for schools and universities to guide the evolvement "through improving the schools we have to creating the schools and systems of education we need." (5, p. 356) In terms of understanding his expectation for the partnerships, one must recognize the vital contribution anticipated by Goodlad for the partnerships in the National Network: that being a possible salvation of public education. Other partnerships have not claimed such an ambitious, long term aspiration.

Beyond the conceptual purposes, assumptions, and guidelines discussed more fully in Chapter Three, a theme runs through the Goodlad Partnership Concept that should not be missed in the rhetoric of defining the parts. Goodlad is drawn to the partnership concept because of its potential for institutional and individual growth. He saw the "efforts to regulate, systematize, or standardize" teaching decisions as being "doomed at the outset, and when implemented, are hazardous to the well-being of individuals and institutions." (6, p.7) The partnership approach, if effective in unleashing the creative energies of educators, is seen as an alternative to legislative change. The partnership concept carries with it a strong belief in the potential of change by the institution itself when a vehicle, such as the partnership, is provided to energize the participants.

The creation of the NNER, consisting of the fourteen partnerships, was done with a great sense of urgency, and, perhaps, with some degree of skepticism. He has proposed a solution, or an approach, that he believes can make a significant difference in the way schools function and be respected by society as a whole. The conceptual framework is

the most sophisticated of other partnerships being proposed. Is it too much to expect the concept to be understood, accepted, and implemented? Sirotnik and Goodlad appear to be asking that when they call the partnerships a "rather deviant idea - an idea that by many accounts should probably not succeed." (6, p.vii)

Based on the first twenty-four months of operation, did the partnerships capture all or part of this vision as articulated by Goodlad? Or, put differently, what parts of the vision have been captured?

Chapter Two
THE STUDY

John I. Goodlad, Director of the National Network for Educational Renewal, asked the writer to conduct a study that would "compare our conception of school-university partnerships with the functioning reality in fourteen settings." (10) Through a formative evaluation, Goodlad sought to gain insight into a number of questions related to the partnerships (See Appendix A for complete listing of partnerships) located in the states of Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. "Who is involved? How committed are they? What are the expectations for the partnership? How is the work being organized? What task forces are in place doing what? What is working well and not working well? " he asked. (10)

In undertaking the study, the writer was given considerable latitude in terms of the individuals to be interviewed in each partnership although the executive director was to be interviewed in each case and other key individuals from the governing board, task forces, or special programs. The executive director was contacted in regard to the visit in his/her state and was expected to help, as each did, with identifying key people to interview or activities to observe. In visiting the fourteen partnerships, it was possible to have at least some contact with each of the seventeen colleges and universities but this was not possible in terms of contacting each of the 115 school districts involved.

The investigator had the freedom to interview, in addition to those persons recommended by the director, other individuals he might select from his knowledge of the state or as might be necessary to pursue a specific issue in the partnership. These interviews were most frequently with persons in designated leadership roles within each partnership. Consequently, there is a built-in selective factor in the interview data.

Lastly Goodlad and the writer agreed that an important addition to the study would be the interviewing of key people outside the partnership but active in setting or carrying out major educational

efforts in the state. These key, outside people were interviewed to determine their knowledge of the partnership operating in the state, their attitude toward elements of the partnership concept in general, and their judgment of the important issues being addressed (or not addressed) by state level actors: the governor, legislature, state board of education or the regents, or the chief state school officer or commissioner of higher education. As the study progressed, the investigator determined it was important to interview persons having a background of contact with other major school-university endeavors or with studies related to the partnership concept. As a result, contacts were made in Washington, D.C., and at a meeting of the Education Commission of the States in St. Louis to interview such persons. With these exceptions, the interviews were conducted within each of the fourteen states.

In total, 150 people were interviewed. One hundred and twenty six (126) were directly related to the fourteen partnerships. Twenty-four others were in the group classified as key outsiders having broad responsibilities in the state (i.e., the state superintendent or commissioner) or a national position dealing with partnership concepts. The classification of the 126 partnership participants interviewed is as follows:

<u>School District Personnel</u>

20 Superintendents
3 Assist. Superintendents
21 Principals
35 Teachers

<u>University Personnel</u>

2 University Presidents
12 Deans
1 Director of Teacher Education
18 University Faculty Members
14 Executive Directors of the Partnerships

The positions held by the twenty-four key outsiders were as follows:

10 Chief State School Officers (State Superintendent or Commissioner)
2 Deputy state superintendents
4 State officials in Higher Education Agencies
1 Key state legislator
1 Executive director of a national organization (CCSSO)
4 Program officers in national level organizations
1 President of Teacher's College
1 Program officer for the Ford Foundation

Of the 150 interviews, most were conducted in individual sessions. However, thirty-eight involved four groups of six or more that took place during luncheon or dinner meetings, or, in one instance, an entire morning discussion involving principals and teacher representatives from three public schools. In the group questioning, the investigator usually dealt with one topic, such as the progress of a specific task force, the reactions toward the agenda set for the partnership, major issues of concern the individuals felt toward their own school, or other matters which the participants might bring up.

In the normal one-to-one interview, the investigator followed the general flow of the Questionnaire shown in Appendix B. The first question for all interviewees had to do with their view of the broader educational problems in their state and/or their geographical area. This opening inquiry was used to establish an understanding of the individual's philosophy but, more importantly, it provided the interviewer an opportunity to see where the partnership fit in terms of these concerns. Questioning after that did not always follow the sequence shown on the interview form. In some interviews, issues arose that were important to pursue and the normal pattern of the questionnaire was abandoned. In a few cases, the individual had a specific expertise, (i.e., research), and the questions were directed almost exclusively to the absence of research, the choice of research topics, or recommendation the person might have in respect to implementing inquiry and research activities within the partnership.

The interviewing of individuals began in early December 1987 and was completed in late May 1988. A minimum of two days was spent in each state and as many as five in some. Updating of the information

gained in earlier interviews was done by telephone in the Summer of 1988 prior to completing the report. Most interviews lasted approximately one hour, although some went as long as two hours or more. The interviews were generally conducted in the individual's work place or immediate vicinity, although in some cases, public school people met at the university site.

The report of the findings are presented primarily in Chapter Three. In this chapter, the writer groups the data around five major topics that surfaced throughout the study. The author has chosen to highlight subjects related to goals, agenda setting, operational issues, the reaction of individuals to each other and to the partnership concept, and, lastly, the perplexing questions related to the absence of research in most of the partnerships. Overall, the study findings look at trends or patterns across the partnerships as a whole and are not intended to be an in-depth evaluation of each partnership.

Chapter Four explores some of the major educational events taking place around the country in 1988. Important shifts are taking place in terms of the state legislative agendas. Attention is given to developments promoting school restructuring and other changes being advocated from the professional world. Consideration is given to the trends suggested by these developments and the questions they pose for those interested in school-university partnerships.

In Chapter Five, the author steps back to examine some of the broader issues that surfaced during the study. When the efforts as a whole are considered, is this concept feasible? Does the emergence of the college and university presidents' statement calling for a nationwide commitment to work with public schools give a boost to the Goodlad Partnership Concept and other collaborative efforts? And always the most challenging query: can the system actually change by its own efforts or must there always be an outside pressure? From the visits, interviews, readings, and the author's impressions from intensive involvement in the world of partnerships for the last six months, the writer lists some final recommendations, actions that might be considered by institutions and states if an expansion of the partnership concept is undertaken.

Chapter Three
MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

Study findings were grouped under five major issues. The general format is the same for each. For each issue there is a brief summary of the relevant conceptual principles, assumptions, or guidelines as articulated by Goodlad. This gives the reader the criteria by which the findings were evaluated in terms of that particular area. Second, there is a summary of the major findings and impressions related to how well that conceptual element was being implemented. Last, in the conclusion and recommendation section, the writer considers the implication of these findings, discusses possible explanations for any discrepancy between the concept advocated and the implementation pattern, and proposes recommendations deemed appropriate.

Two cautions need to be stated. As is the case in any formative study taking place over several months, situations and leaders change, discussions suddenly yield a new direction, and the partnership evolves to a different level. Inasmuch as partnerships are not static but subject to ongoing change, observations in the spring of 1988 may have been outdated a few months later by new developments. Thus, the writer may comment on conditions that have changed in subsequent months. This study looked at fourteen sites and even this aspect is subject to change as partnerships may be dropped and others may be added to the Network*

.

Second, a bias of the investigator should be acknowledged. Admittedly, there may be other biases of which the writer is unaware but one in particular surfaced frequently. Serving for fourteen years as a state commissioner of education, he experienced state board meetings, legislative budget hearings, governor's briefings, and media interviews that pushed the writer to think in terms of goals, related activities, time lines, costs, and a general accountability plan in

---

* At the time of writing, one of the fourteen is no longer a member of the NNER but a new partnership involving the University of Connecticut and several neighboring school districts has been formed and has been accepted into the NNER.

proposing or defending any program or proposal. The writer found himself pushing to identify a similar structure for the partnerships. This probably reflected a desire to impose a framework of established organizations on a new, evolving entity, and it may have been an unfair expectation, especially when so much of what Goodlad and his associates have written poses a developmental conception of the change process.

Beginning programs, such as the partnerships, need an empathy and a long range perspective. New endeavors seeking to establish their identity, walk lightly, and look back frequently. Such organizations are fragile creatures. Eventually, the writer was able to bring this latter level of sensitivity to the review of the fourteen sites. It was helpful not to ask if the partnership had arrived at the Goodlad Partnership Model, but rather, had the participants started the march and did they know the destination over the horizon. There was a concurrent, balancing belief injected, too: that being that a Pollyanna could do everyone an injustice when a new creation is most in need of an honest questioning as a nurturing contribution.

INTERNALIZATION OF THE PARTNERSHIP GOAL

Discuss goals and one often sees the listeners gear up for a "heavy" discussion, or their eyes gloss over in anticipation of esoteric expressions with little meaning. This was not the case with Goodlad's focus for the partnerships: improve schooling and the education of educators. He saw these as inseparable goals. It was to these ends that higher education and the public schools needed to come together to form a partnership.

In terms of the institutional purposes Goodlad defined three:

1. The exemplary performance by universities of their educational responsibility to those seeking to become educators or to enhance their present performance as as educators. (Increasing the usefulness of the university research function is a major part of this responsibility.)
2. The exemplary performance by schools of their educational function and accompanying exemplary performance of school districts in providing the necessary support

3. The exemplary performance of both universities and schools (and their school districts) in collective arrangements and processes that promote both of the above purposes. (6, p.26)

Behind these statements of goals and purposes, it was Goodlad's belief that the focus should move from the students and teachers to attention on reform of the institutions or programs. To clarify each partnership's focus, Goodlad saw value in each unit drawing up a "small set of beliefs about what education is and what this conception means for priorities, programs, and practices." (6, p.24)

Finally, Goodlad underscores the importance of having a direction, when, after acknowledging that partnerships are "in" currently, he reminds the reader that they could soon be out. If this happens, he says:

> This will not be because they serve no purpose. Rather, it will be because of the concept's natural appeal, on the one hand, and failure of the advocates to be clear on purposes and limitations, on the other. (9, p.78)

Do the partnership planning and activities suggest that these goals are in fact internalized by the directors, governing boards, and the institutions? It has been said, "Excellence must be in the mind of someone!" Is it?

Findings

In six of the partnerships, my interviews suggest a reasonably clear sense of direction and some significant strides had been taken since organizing.

Arkansas: Several member districts have given high priority to school program and structure changes. In a state where limited interaction has taken place between schools and higher education, the partnership has opened doors previously closed. The partnership has drawn the attention of state officials and has become a part of a state emphasis on school restructuring.

Massachusetts: This is one of the most refined local network programs in terms of the level of public school dialogue and programs at individual schools. The University of Massachusetts at Amherst is

involved through the Curriculum and Instruction unit. This consortium came into the NNER as a well established network of cooperating schools. The partnership lacks a tie to a broader institutional commitment involving members of the faculty and changes in the teacher education program.

Michigan: Although small in terms of the number of public school and Michigan State University staff involved, this partnership has demonstated an understanding of the conceptual elements. There is a sense of understanding by the participants at both levels. The question now rests on the potential of the program to be extended, to have broader school district participation, and to maintain university staff involvement.

Utah: As one of the early leaders in the movement, Brigham Young University has continued its commitment. The focus on campus change seems more pronounced than that found in the school districts. The University has made the partnership quite central to its future.

Washington: Probably the most ambitious and complex of the partnership efforts, this partnership shows signs of gaining a gradual but strong acceptance in terms of school district internalization and some very strong leadership pockets on which to build. This is less true of the University where the concept has not had an appreciable impact beyond several faculty members who have been active from the beginning.

Wyoming: Movement by the School of Education and the participating school districts has been extensive. While much of the early focus rested on revamping the teacher education program, school district change has occurred, too, with a growing appreciation of what can be accomplished by school-university collaboration.

The reasons vary as to why the partnership goals seem to have become more established in these six of the fourteen partnerships. One of the explanations might be in the leadership, location, and persistence in the early life of the partnership of one or several persons who brought an emphasis to the institutional focus and the goals. The key people have come from higher education in three instances (**Massachusetts, Michigan,** and **Wyoming**), school districts in one (**Washington**), and a combination of district and state officials in the two (**Arkansas and Utah**). It should be noted that the Massachusetts and Utah partnerships are among the oldest in the group of fourteen.

For eight of the partnerships, less progress has been made toward the established goals. In these settings, the writer often heard such comments as:

> I'm not sure there is agreement and understanding regarding about what the partnership is.
>
> Goals are not clear. If they were, I think this would be a rallying point.

After listening to one group give their impressions of what the partnership was all about, the author suggested the two goals Goodlad has articulated. Later, a key member of the governing board said, "I think that's the first time I've heard what we are supposed to be doing." The board chairman suggested that, "It is a case of marketability. The goals of the partnership are not understood."

Specifically, what seemed to operate in the eight partnerships to frustrate greater attention to goals and purposes? In each case there have been discussions, task forces, and some excellent activities, but, in the end, one is pressed to find a consistent direction or commitment building towards the ends visualized by Goodlad.

At the risk of generalizing, these are the writer's impressions as they relate to the question of goals in these eight partnerships:

Arizona: Focus appears to be on establishing rapport between public school and higher education personnel. Parties enjoy the discussions but there seems to be no agreed on plan for carrying these exchanges to a higher level. Little evidence was seen to suggest that higher education related the partnership to potential changes in the program of the University. A new executive director had just come on board.

California: Individual schools appear to be following up on the discussions held throughout the year but there seems to be an absence of a focus by all parties on programmatic or institutional changes. The university partner had recently changed.

Colorado: Emphasis has been given to task force efforts that appear to have no clear tie back to the institutions involved. Leaders seem to have little expectation that the partnership endeavors can advance the quality of schooling in the districts or improve teacher education efforts. There have been three executive directors in the short history of this partnership.

Hawaii: After adopting some existing programs as a partnership base, there appears to have been little movement to internalize the goals of a partnership and use the collaboration to further changes at the University or solve persistent public school problems. Again, there is a new executive director, the first having died in an automobile accident.

Indiana: The members appear to be some distance from internalizing the goals of a partnership and did not express any strong feeling that the meetings to date have in fact led to any changes in the program of the University or the member districts.

Maine: Participants were enthusiastic about the partnership meetings and the topics discussed. Some changes were reported in individual schools as a result of the collegial exchanges. If plans developed after the writer's visit unfold as scheduled in 1988-89, the partnership will have made significant strides toward the partnership goals. Maine, at the time of my visit, was close to belonging with the group of six.

New York: This partnership has a special situation. There is need for this unit to clarify what in fact can be achieved by a school-university collaboration in the New York City setting. It is unlikely that school restructuring or even major program changes in a school can be achieved through the partnership. Improvements in the preparation of educators might have to be the primary focus. Currently, however, there was little indication that participants have established clear goals and purposes to fit the limitations faced. Educational improvement in this setting does not come easily.

Virginia: Despite active participation by large numbers of public school personnel, no unifying sense for the broader partnership goals seemed to come through from the participants. Nor was it clear as to the contribution the partnership was expected to make to the University in terms of program changes.

The change in leadership is significant, and the position of executive director is itself an innovation.

There was indication that the partnership goals simply were not acceptable to some directors and members of the governing boards. Eight of the directors believed the school unit should be the emphasis (a strong element in Goodlad's position) - even though, in several cases, the partnership program did not reflect this and board members did not agree with this position. Two partnerships (**New York** and **Indiana**) did not appear to find the school focus acceptable. For the most part, however, the public school representatives were much more open to

change and discussion of the tough problems than was true of their higher education counterparts.

At the university level, the writer encountered some unexpected resistance to directors and/or deans discussing the improvement of individual preparation programs and programmatic change with faculty members. One partnership director, a university faculty member, indicated that no effort had been made to bring the partnership goals to the university faculty because these "would scare the faculty." One dean of a school of education said he held off involvement of the faculty because "they are not ready." This reaction may be indicative of the potential power of the concept. He was not alone in these feelings. In all, eight partnerships expressed a reluctance to involve the university faculty on the topic of the partnership's agenda or they did so on a very selective basis. Goodlad considers the reluctance of university personnel to work closely with school people to be both a serious problem and evidence of need for school-university collaboration.

The assumption that the partnerships would be aided by the adoption of a "brief statement of beliefs" did not appear to be fulfilled in terms of this having helped establish any degree of consensus or guidance for the partnerships. Four partnerships had a general mission statement of their goals and the importance of the collaboration between the parties.

Finally, part of the lack of focus on the partnerships' goals may stem from the members hearing half of the message regarding school-university collaboration. They heard the importance of joint meetings and interacting. They heard the stress on local latitude and flexibility. They did not hear the specific goals and purposes spelled out in the mission statement and the expectation for all partnerships to focus on those program and structural changes necessary to achieve the partnership ends. The result has come to be an over reliance on the process to establish a sense of purpose. While partnerships may follow this path to the same ends and the changes visualized by Goodlad, the local autonomy emphasis has the potential of carrying partnerships off in different directions and attention to less extensive goals. This appears to have happened in some partnerships, regardless of their supposed commitment to the mission statement of the NNER in which common goals are clearly stated.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Partnerships can make a difference in the functioning performance of local schools and schools of education. In six of the states visited there was solid evidence to this fact. Even in the eight partnerships showing less progress, there were examples of where the partnerships had provided an impetus to change. The concept appears to have validity and can be implemented by schools and universities when forceful leadership is present in at least one of the parties.

2. There was a great tendency for leaders in the partnerships to undervalue the establishment of clear goals and purposes. Failing to set and internalize a common direction tended to cause a diluting of the partnership focus and a greater potential for taking on less important priorities, a lowered sense of satisfaction for those participating in partnership efforts, and/or a greater willingness to settle on dialogue and social returns rather than achievement of a more meaningful, action agenda. Failure to adopt clear goals reduced the chances of communicating the partnership's purposes to other leaders and policymakers within the state who could become "allies in the cause."

3. Partnerships lacking a clear sense of direction contrasted sharply with state officials who, when interviewed in those same states, had defined ends and a strategy to move toward their goals. From the writer's perspective it was clear why forces other than the partnership members were driving the educational agenda in these states. Of course, partnership goals were never intended to encompass an entire state.

4. **Recommendation**: Some partnerships have had over two years to demonstrate their capacity to come together in a collaborative effort to address the goals established for the Network. Member districts and schools of education, not just the superintendents and deans from these institutions, should either agree to work toward these ends in a very demonstrable way or withdraw from the partnership. Likewise, the partnership, itself, should demonstrate an earnest commitment to the goals and purposes articulated or it should be dropped from the Network.

5. **Recommendation**: Assuming that partnerships will be added

and deleted from time to time in the Network any new partnership being considered for membership should go through an intensive orientation period, emphasizing the mission of the Network. A partnership should be accepted only when its mission is clearly seen as focusing on the established goals and purposes of the Network. At time of writing, a new partnership has been admitted, after meeting rather rigorous demands with respect to commitment and intent.

AGENDA SETTING

An agenda indicates the listing of things to be accomplished or the program of activities to be undertaken. As Goodlad perceived the partnership, he listed three assumptions for the programmatic focus of the partnerships, and provided eight examples of agenda items. It is assumed that:

1. Individual schools and individual preparation programs are the units of improvement. (6, p.24)
2. The partnerships being entered into are symbiotic in nature - that is, two different kinds of organisms (institutions) are joining for the satisfaction of mutual self-interests. (6, p.23)
3. The current opportunity to restructure schooling and the education of educators will pass by unless the policies enacted (and not enacted) succeed in unleashing the energy of educators and then providing the infrastructure by means of which this energy will be constructively guided and supported. (6, p.25)

It can be seen that Goodlad anticipated that the partnership focus would be on the school; that the partnership would reflect a symbiotic relationship; and that we dare not miss this chance to restructure and tap the energy of the educators. In addition, Goodlad expressed an overall belief that "the partnership is to be used as a device for bringing together the institutions that need each other for the solution of tough problems." (6, p.26)

His agenda topics were meant to convey the range and depth of the items that he believes to be worthy of a partnership effort. The summarized list reflects topics from his Study of Schooling, issues from such writers as Boyer and Sizer, and surveys of those tough challenges

often neglected in reform efforts. Goodlad assumed that partnerships joining the NNER bought into the following agenda:

1. Creation of exemplary sites in which future teachers are education
2. Creation of internships and residencies for educational specialists
3. Development of curricula that truly reflect the best analyses and projections of what young people need
4. The assurance of equal access by all students to these curricula
5. The cultivation of site-based staff development activities designed to foster continued school renewal
6. The restructuring of schools to assure increased continuity of students' programs, decreased accumulation of partial inadequate or misdirected learnings, decreased alienation and dropping out of students, and more effective utilization of varied teaching resources
7. The infusion of knowledge relative to provision of good education in schools and in programs preparing educators
8. The creation and utilization of opportunities to promote in the community a continuing, informed dialogue about education. (6, p. 27)

In examining the agenda of each of the partnerships, the writer sought to determine if the Goodlad assumptions were reflected in the planning, if the partnership took on the 'tough problems', and if the illustrative agenda items were typical points of focus for the units.

Findings

When considering the partnership response to the three assumptions and the willingness to take on the tough issues, the writer would group the partnerships into two broad categories: Group 1 where the agenda currently reflects or is moving to include those priorities suggested by Goodlad, and Group 2 where there seems to be a searching for a consensus or a decision to pursue other directions.

Group 1. (**Arkansas, Massachusetts, Maine, Michigan, Utah, Washington, Wyoming**) Most of these partnerships have or are moving to some element of a school-level focus. **Arkansas** has been drawn

into state efforts and developments with the Coalition of Essential Schools that have pushed the partnership into a school-level involvement. **Maine, Michigan,** and **Washington** have given stress to planning for Professional Development Schools. For Michigan this will build on some outstanding school-level involvement. The **Massachusetts** program is driven in large part by the priorities identified by individual schools. Restructuring as such has not been pushed. By responding to the agenda setting by the individual schools, the activities undertaken, without demeaning this approach in any way, can best be labeled as school improvement efforts for the most part, rather than joint school and university improvement.

Taken as a whole, these partnerships should provide some valuable models in another two years. The seven organizations demonstrate the school-university interactions that Goodlad outlined. While not ideal, there is a joint planning between the public schools and universities that is projecting these units into the "tough issues." All of them have addressed at least four of the suggested agenda topics. The involvements have incorporated, in varying degrees, campus-level activities of note. **Wyoming**, beginning with teacher education changes as the driving force, has brought an exemplary sense of unity to the partnership members while achieving a progress some felt could not have been attained in the pre-partnership times. **Utah**, after some noteworthy achievements, appears to have plateaued somewhat, put too much emphasis on task forces, and sits at a point of needing to redefine its agenda to focus on current school or teacher education needs. There is a shift in deans this year, since the current dean at B.Y.U. has retired. In summary, although each would have its concerns and shortcomings, there is a feeling in these seven partnerships that something significant is being accomplished, and the optimism and satisfaction outweigh the frustration.

Partnerships in Group 2 appear to be struggling to achieve a meaningful agenda. Among these seven are some that could "break out" in coming months. **Hawaii** maintains programs that were basically in place when the partnership started but seems unable to move to that next level of dealing with the significant issues that all parties readily identified. **Arizona** has established a base of rapport but has not

determined that the partnership can be a vehicle for impacting or leading change efforts by the participants. Although the foundation is there, no substantive agenda has emerged. A new and energetic executive director may change all this. **California** has a legacy of experience to draw on and some of the partnership elements are in place, but an agreed on agenda of significance is not one of them.

In the four remaining partnerships, **Colorado, Indiana, New York,** and **Virginia**, there is a similarity: strong individual leaders who often are engaged in major reform efforts in their own institutions, but have formulated no cohesive agenda that excite the members and cause them to feel the partnership could contribute to school-level or university change. Separating the final four from the other three is a level of frustration that could cause some of the participants in these four units to reconsider their partnership commitment unless countered with a meaningful, collective effort toward at least one unifying and useful focus.

The inability to set an agenda did not stem from a lack of time committed to this phase. One partnership had spent "fifteen to twenty meetings on this one issue." For the most part the respondents reported struggling to identify a common interest. Typically, the search moved through a sequence of listing the topics of interest to the parties and a gradual sifting of these items to identify a common denominator topic that all could agree on. Particularly in the seven partnerships having the greatest difficulty with agenda setting, a common pattern developed in the interview responses in relationship to this cycle.

The individuals were asked to list major educational problems or the needs of their own institution. Later, when the agenda items undertaken by the partnerships were discussed, there was little commonality between these topics and the high priority themes mentioned earlier. "Why this discrepancy?" the writer asked of the respondents. Some of the answers were very insightful:

-"I'm from a larger district than most of these districts. My problems are not their problems."

-"None of these topics - i.e., teacher turnover in my district (30%-40% annually), collective bargaining pressures that prevent any real

change in the district, or the political forces in our state that prevent change - are appropriate for partnership discussion."

-"We have so many problems in our district I wouldn't know how to begin to bring these to the partnership."

-"I come here for the opportunity to grow personally. I'm not anxious to see us (the partnership) try to take on my problems."

-"I like the discussions. I get a lot of ideas for use in my district. The important thing is for the people going to the meetings from our district to come back and use these ideas here. It's what we do here in the districts that counts."

-"The partnership is for sharing. I don't look to the partnership for any outcomes."

-"The partnership can't really do anything - the policymakers aren't there (school boards and higher education governance representatives). It's not a place for an action agenda."

One common response was most intriguing to the interviewer. When higher education or school officials were asked why the big issues were not being discussed and placed on the agenda by the partnership the response was, "I personally would like to see the partnership take on the 'tough issues' but the rest of the group isn't ready." One of these exchanges is recorded here to suggest the complexity of this response:

(I=Interviewer, R=Respondent)

I - Yesterday the group seemed very tentative in discussing issues in their districts and some of the agenda items the partnership could consider. Yet, a number of the people around the table were very strong - very creative. Why the hesitation?

R - I would have liked to raise some of the big issues. In fact that's what makes my attendance at some national meetings I attend so exciting.

I - But you don't find that same excitment here. Why don't you bring up some of these exciting issues here?

R - I don't think the group is ready for that. We haven't matured to that point yet.

I - You are there yourself but you don't feel the others are. What will tell you -or make you realize- that at some point in the future you will enter the partnership meeting and say, "Now we're ready. We have matured?"

R - I guess one of the criteria would be the ability of the group to deal with an emotional issue - or a topic some of us feel strongly about - and not get angry or defensive about it.

I - Is it the responsibility of the Chairman to judge when this appropriate time has arrived?

R - Yes. I suppose it would be the job of the Chairman.

I - Have you talked to the Chairman about this?

R - No.

I - In terms of the group reaching this maturity you are looking for , do you have some responsibility for helping them reach this level?

R - Good point.

The setting of an agenda involves some very personal feelings and beliefs. When universities were willing to reach out, honestly lay some significant needs on the table and ask for assistance in solving them, the genesis of a partnership was formed and a major step was taken toward creation of a more trusting, school-university relationship. For a variety of reasons, this "leap of faith" - this willingness to work through the doubts and concerns some members feel - has not been triggered in some of the remaining partnerships.

In relationship to the setting of the partnership agenda, there were other issues raised by a number of respondents. While more critical to some partnerships than others, they are matters over which there was no consensus, or issues for which few had a solution.

The absence of secondary school programs. Elementary schools were much more apt to be involved in partnership activities than secondary units. When asked why no secondary schools were involved in programs of school change, the reactions were much the same, "Secondary schools are a tough nut to crack."

The **California** partnership has tried to organize programs and discussion sessions for secondary schools with mixed results. Asked why, the Claremont Graduate School faculty member indicated several reasons: "The logistics of sessions are hard. Secondary people have more difficulty getting free than elementary. The secondary school demands after school are extensive. Secondary people seem more interested in their subject matter focus or specific job assignments than the broader aspects of the school operation. As a result, partnership meetings are given low priority."

Fordham University (**New York**) has provided discussion and sharing sessions involving university faculty members and New York City high school principals and other staff. When the writer asked about a more extensive effort involving the school itself, public school people pointed out that this would require a faculty member per high school to have even mimimal impact and the principals doubted that the university could make this degree of commitment. Because of the complexity in administering a large urban high school, the principals felt the best the partnership could do was to provide a place to meet people and to hear ideas. "The partnership is for sharing," said one.

In **Arkansas** the partnership contains participants in Ted Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools Project and this gives this group a tie to a specific secondary change model. The writer saw other secondary school efforts being made in **Maine, Massachusetts, Washington,** and **Arizona.** Partnerships were trying to 'crack the nut' but most reported great difficulty in doing so.

School versus School District Agenda Focus. Another major agenda hurdle has developed when the partnership has to decide to deal with the school based focus suggested by Goodlad or a school district approach generally favored by the superintendents. Since the latter often make up a large part of the governing board, the school district topics tend to win out in the agenda setting. Partnership directors were philosophically in support of the school based approach but indicated the emphasis tends to go to school district issues. Adopting strictly a district focus has certain implications:

-District level efforts generally drive the partnership to the establishment of task forces as a means of studying a topic and bringing the analysis and recommendations back to the partnership for reaction. The weaknesses of task forces are discussed later but suffice to say at this point this approach has been less than satisfactory as a means of attacking school district concerns through the partnership.

-A school district focus requires district level involvement, and superintendents, already frustrated with the time demands of partnership meetings, are reluctant to spend additional time on district level agenda efforts. For superintendents of small districts this is a particularly difficult task.

-The outcome of decisions or projects undertaken are subject to acceptance by others. District topics often involve school boards and/or state decision-making bodies who are not active members of the partnership.

These are not insurmountable challenges but the dynamics of district change are much different from school-level redirection. A school focus:

-Usually means selecting some schools for involvement and leaving others out.
-Suggests an autonomy that district leaders feel uneasy about.
-Has the potential for putting the school into conflict with district curriculum, personnel, and operating policies.
-Requires the active participation of principals and teachers and leaves the superintendents out.

These are chronic problems of educational improvement. The listings above are not meant to be exhaustive but to suggest the dynamics of this particular decision. It is a dilemma and one that was not been anticipated by many districts when they joined the partnerships. How do partnerships attend to school-level changes and satisfy boards made up of superintendents?

In regard to Goodlad's list of suggested agenda topics, the writer would make these observations about four of the items. All partnerships had provided special programs to the members in awareness and knowledge building efforts. The value of these meetings organized around a theme or a visiting speaker was singled out by many as an important partnership contribution. In some cases, special conferences were open to the public and were seen as being helpful to bringing a visibility to the partnership and its service to the area and the profession.

Two of the suggested items may be slow to win acceptance as agenda topics. Partnerships were not adopting a focus on curriculum writing and working to ensure student access to these products. Perhaps this was not seen as being appropriate to the partnership activities. Indeed, some participants view curriculum writing as not the best way to improve curricula. Perhaps it was the cost of curriculum writing

which could consume much of a limited partnership budget. Or, it might have been seen as something best left to the prerogative of the individual district or, in a more centralized state, by the department of education. While the two topics are not currently on most partnership lists of things to do, it could be that these matters will gain attention as the partnerships mature.

Throughout the Goodlad Partnership Concept, there is a strong appeal for partnerships to pursue the restructuring of schools. The term 'restructure' has become a major topic of discussion in the partnerships. Some found it to be such a lightening rod that new terminology, like "developing schools," was suggested to overcome what partnership participants perceived as a very negative connotation. Others preferred the idea of school improvement because "we can always improve what we are doing." But restructure means, said one, "the present school structure is bad and needs a total overhaul. I don't buy that." The concept draws a mixture of support and condemnation. Acceptance of the idea as the centerpiece for the partnerships should not be assumed as a given.

A little discussed assumption, but a major part of the Partnership Concept, rests on Goodlad's belief that a partnership can succeed when two different organisms (schools and universities) join in a common effort for the satisfaction of mutual self-interests. This he describes as a symbiotic relationship.(6, p.23) Each party can and does pursue a self-interest without any entanglement with the other party. However, Goodlad believes there is a sufficient gain, almost a synergistic expansion, that comes from a combined effort that justifies and argues for the existence of a school-university partnership.

Because this is so central to the Goodlad Partnership Concept, and has important implications for setting the agenda, the following paragraphs 1) pursue the symbiotic concept in greater depth, 2) examine the organic relationship theory as an alternative belief, and 3) apply the symbiotic theory to the operation of the partnerships.

For a symbiotic relationship to have a potential for enhancement of two entities, there is an implied belief that the parties do in fact work in a similar context of knowledge and interests. There has to be enough commonality that a coming together can be of benefit to the two

parties. Inasmuch as school personnel came through the higher education environment, one could argue that there is in fact a basis for a relationship and that the criticism of one, the public schools, is also an attack on the effectiveness of higher education in preparing the personnel directing the schools. Whether or not this basic commonality is adequate for a symbiotic relationship has been challenged by some who feel the two cultures are so different, a true partnership cannot be founded. Goodlad acknowledges the differences but feels there is enough commonality.

Since some partnerships are working, it would appear that differences can be overcome, a common base does exist, and failure to achieve an effective partnership rests on other factors.

An analysis of the differences between organic and symbiotic relationships as stated by Schlechty and Whitford (6, p.191-192) provides another way at looking at school-university relationships:

> In our view, the cause of school reform would be much advanced if collaborative efforts moved from symbiotic relationships to organic relationships. In organic relationships, the parts fulfill unique functions, sometimes in a semi-autonomous fashion, but the purpose of these functions is to serve the body of the whole." "Thus, unlike symbiotic relationships, which emphasize mutual self-interest, organic relationships stress the common good above all else.

In summary of the two positions, a description is given by the authors that is particularly helpful:

> The situation approximates. "I'll help you with your concerns, and you'll help me with mine." In contrast, organic relationships focus on concerns or problems which are mutually owned; they are *our* problems. (6, p.192)

> We agree that collaborative relationships can be formed on the basis of enlightened self-interest, and since this is the case, it is probably best to

> view these relationships as symbiotic. Our problem is that symbiotic relationships are inherently fragile, temporary, and even given to fickleness. (6, p.191)

Applying this analysis to the agenda setting process, one might use these two illustrations to show the significance of the organic and symbiotic differences:

Example A. (Organic) Schools and universities come together or are brought together to solve the societal concern of high school dropouts, low graduation rates, and low minority enrollments in post-secondary institutions. Parties seek or are asked to develop solutions to these problems and work together, if appropriate, to address these concerns.

Example B. (Symbiotic) Schools and universities come together to solve concerns each sees as important to its own well-being. Public schools identify alienation of students - particularly at the secondary level. Universities identify the placement of student teachers with high quality schools and classroom teachers. The parties decide that these are the highest priorities for each and that the problems can best be solved by the two parties working together and drawing on the strengths of each other.

In the symbiotic relationship, the setting of an agenda requires that each party have an understanding of one's own responsibilities and goals and has made a judgment as to the effectiveness by which these roles are being carried out. Achieving the self-interests of each party is perhaps better stated, therefore, as becoming more effective in achieving one's responsibilties and goals. In the organic relationship, a problem or concern becomes the focus and the organizational analysis of one's overall effectiveness is not that vital.

In applying these two positions to the agenda setting problems encountered by the partnerships, the differences become profound:

-The agenda for the *organic* relationship can be established without regard to the effectiveness by which one is now functioning but merely by the selection of a common end justifying a collaborative effort. This would not be possible in a *symbiotic* relationship that ideally requires an enlightened analysis of each party's effectiveness prior to setting the agenda to guide the relationship in a common effort.

-In the *organic* relationship, the setting of the common goal or problem to be solved can be externally established even with little

contribution of the two parties, i.e., a legislative mandate that identifies secondary truancy and dropout rate as a major societal issue and funds
collaborative efforts of secondary schools and institutions of higher education. The *symbiotic* relationship requires that the two parties set the agenda as an important growth experience for the participants and, in part, as a way of anticipating and limiting outside forces driving the educational agenda.

-The *organic* relationship focuses on the setting of a common agenda and the development of programs to achieve these ends. If the ends are set by others, then the creativeness and ownership comes by virtue of designing the strategies for achieving the identified objectives. The *symbiotic* relationship develops creativeness and ownership by a more extensive interaction of the parties in understanding each other's needs, setting objectives to address these needs, and designing strategies to reach these ends.

Applied to the Goodlad Partnership Concept, a symbiotic approach would seem to require that the schools and the university begin their relationship with an understanding of each other's needs and a clear sense of purpose by each as to how the effectiveness of schools and the university will be enhanced by a partnership. With a shared understanding of each others needs, an agenda would be established to meet these needs Although simply stated, it is a very sophisticated expectation.

Assuming that a partnership achieves a symbiotic relationship in which the self-interests of each party are realized, what follows such an accomplishment? Goodlad and Sirotnik (6, p. 218) foresee the evolvement to "a new organic, relationship combining features of the other organisms (institutions)." Schlechty and Whitford (6, p. 203) suggest that once collaboration evolves to the point the parties have a common language and a common culture, education has a chance of becoming a "progressive profession" in a new organization. Elsewhere, Schlechty and Whitford refer to this new creation as a "boundary-spanning organization" that has sufficient power "to compel actions and support from the participating parties." (6, p. 194) Either scenario is possible and would be determined in large part by local conditions and leadership.

However, the evolvement may take yet a different direction. A public school and university partnership may move from an effort oriented to fulfilling the self-interests of each party to a collaborative endeavor for the common or public good. Instead of continuing an inward or strictly professional or institutional focus advancing the interests of each, the parties may become secure enough in their relationship to turn their energies to a collective attack on broader societal issues.

This shift of focus may come as the relationship matures, but achieving a high level of sensitivity to the needs external to the organizations should be possible once a common culture has been established between the two parties. Instead of a societal issue and remedy being imposed by outside forces, the parties might become very proficient in identifying the changes needed and the potential solutions. What begins then as a symbiotic connection may evolve over the years to a relationship quite unlike anything predicted by the parties themselves.

In Goodlad's concept, this unpredictable transformation results from releasing the synergistic potential of the partnership. He argues that there is greater potential for true collaboration when the problem identified for joint effort is a common problem in the existence of both partners. When both join to solve a problem not in their mutual self-interests, collaboration stops when the problem is solved. Consequently, he views a symbiotic relationship to be vital to long-term stability in the partnership.

While few of the partnerships have consciously set out to test or follow the principles of a symbiotic relationship, some units have done quite well in establishing some semblance of a symbiotic pattern. Observing the partnerships in terms of the elements of a symbiotic relationship, the writer saw the following examples:

Wyoming, Michigan, Massachusetts, and Utah are examples of university initiative to define their own self-interests or areas of needed change and set out a partnership plan in such an attractive manner that the schools were willing to join in a relationship that was seen as being beneficial to them as well. While it was not a simultaneous development at the beginning for some, the schools soon found ways to pursue school improvement changes by their involvement and were assisted in these efforts by the universities. The universities

were in search of a specific set of ends - namely research, the improvement of their student teaching programs, or opportunities for graduate students to interact with the schools in the solution of "real" problems. The schools and school districts saw these as needed educational priorities and were pleased that the universities had reached out for assistance in these undertakings.

The school districts in **Washington** provided the push for the partnership in that state. The agenda set reflects a heavy weighting to the interests of the district participants. In the initial stages, the university has seemed unwilling to share its needs and aspirations in a comparable manner but has shown evidence of willingness to work with school-based problems.

From these five illustrations, it would seem that simultaneous development of the elements of a symbiotic relationship are the exception. Also, even though one partner carries the lead role, given leadership, a focus the other party can relate to, and the proper attitude in the collaborative unfolding, a symbiotic relationship can evolve. Some obvious questions arise in regard to these situations. Can partnerships continue after the initiating thrust of the one partner has been achieved? Can, or should, a partnership continue with one partner obviously less than enthusiastic about the union?

Arkansas and Maine appear to be working their way through a simultaneous growth process. Districts are becoming better at identifying their needs and expectations, and the college and universities seem more and more willing to put their concerns and resources on the table.

In the remaining seven partnerships, the difficulties have varied in terms of their ability to form a true partnership in the symbiotic sense. These partnerships seem almost to have become more *organic* in the sense that they are seeking or waiting for a common goal to emerge and seem unwilling to be driven by seeking a relationship around their own high priority institutional needs. Interestingly, searching for this organic relationship appears to have delayed their progress. Absent a willingness to put these high needs out as a basis for planning, how long does a partnership continue the "agenda waltz?" As more than one key participant said in these units, "Unless we get a meaningful agenda I can't justify my time here." Is an agenda of mutual self-interests likely to be the more productive one?

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The establishing of a partnership agenda continues to be one of the most unresolved and frustrating steps for half of the partnerships. Resolution of this issue is critical to maintaining any momentum at all in these units. In some cases where one party, such as the university took the leadership in establishing the agenda, there may come a time in these partnerships when the next agenda setting experience will be a challenge, but these groups should have a base of personal relationships to carry them through that part of an ongoing partnership cycle.

One of the main contributors to the frustration over the agenda setting was the search for a "common-denominator" topic of interest. Parties sacrificed their institutional priorities and a chance to focus on their major problems in favor of a "consensus" agenda topic which proved difficult to secure.

Recommendation: Partnerships must give up their search for the common-denominator topic as a focus. The aim must be toward having each member of the unit work on the high priority needs felt by that member. This may mean that only three districts have a similar focus. It may be that the university has only minimum involvement in such a project and the bulk of the sharing and activity goes on between the three partners. Unless members work on their highest needs, the value of the partnership is lost, boards of education can question the expenditure of time and money, and the intensity of commitment is reduced. The ideal, according to Goodlad, is that institutions identify mutual, over-lapping, self-interests.

2. Public school personnel were more aggressive in their search for change strategies and were more willing to put their needs on the table for discussion. Higher education representatives seemed unwilling or unable to make a similar commitment. This raises the whole issue of the role of the university and its ability to set goals and priorities internally.

3. While the concept of a symbiotic relationship was an important one to the founder of the Network, the principle and its implications were not fully appreciated by many of the key actors in the partnerships.

4. In contrast to the national discussion of "restructuring of schools" by governors, legislators, and other reform advocates, this was not a phrase that was uniformly accepted by educators. A gap exists in this sense and could be the basis for a future public-professional split. Even among partnership leaders open to the topic, there was somewhat of a division over the agenda of the partnership: Should they be seeking improvement of the schools or restructuring of the schools? Or both?

5. The absence of attention to models for expediting secondary school change is a major shortcoming and concern in the partnership efforts to date. Secondary partnership models were lacking, not only in the National Network, but also in the models cited earlier in Goodlad's review of his forty years of involvement with the partnership concept (6, p. 14-20). There is an elementary school flavor coming through in these reports.

Recommendation: The lack of secondary school models for change should be given high priority consideration by the National Network for Educational Renewal. Network programs featuring this challenge should be undertaken. Each partnership should be encouraged to consider establishing a minimum of one secondary change model.

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

For the most part Goodlad did not seek to prescribe heavily in the organizational area. Partnerships were expected to organize in a way that was meaningful for the specific partnership. Twelve organizational guidelines were listed by Goodlad (6, p.27-29), and are summarized below:

- A governing board, preferably but not necessarily composed of the superintendent of each collaborating school district and the dean of the participating college or university
-An executive director and necessary support services provided by a secretary and preferably, a research assistant - paid by the partnership budget
-An operating budget providing both money and specifically assigned personnel from the participating institutions

-Top-level endorsement and support from each institution's chief executive officer and, ultimately, university involvement beyond the school or college of education

-Task forces or working parties, each charged with developing plans and strategies for addressing the most critical and most calcified problems of improving schooling and the education of educators

-An orderly process within each partnership of endorsing and encouraging all projects and activities undertaken in the partnership so as to assure understanding and a minimum of bureaucratic procedures

-An ongoing effort to document, analyze, and communicate successes and failures

-The establishment and maintenance of connecting linkages with the National Network for purposes of giving help to and receiving help from other partnerships

-A deliberate effort to secure additional funds from external funding sources

-The redirection of existing funds within and across institutions for purposes of securing the time necessary for educational renewal

-A formal time commitment of at least five years

-Arrangements for sharing information, ideas, and even resources within and across partnerships, including the sharing of responsibility for advocating the best in educational policy and practice.

While the organizational aspects were not a main subject of the interviews, some factors were cited by respondents because they believed these matters had impacted the effectiveness of the partnerships. Only these operational issues are singled out for review.

Findings

Twelve of the partnerships followed the recommendation to establish a governing board involving superintendents and the university dean. The strength of these boards and their degree of direction to the partnerships varied tremendously. Two of the more effective partnerships did not rely on governing boards. **Massachusetts** utilizes a combination of school improvement teams, school councils, and study teams, centralizing leadership in one person - the director. **Michigan** did not utilize a governing board but worked directly with district leaders in setting up programs in the district.

The responses of various participants indicated the governing boards have some common characteristics:

-Superintendents are busy people and it is hard to get them to board meetings

-Superintendents must be involved but are not the ones to do planning and follow through

-Deans participate fairly well but do not inform their faculties of the partnership activities and programs

-Most boards meet monthly although **Indiana** voted recently to go to bimonthly meetings.

All boards appeared to have a high degree of talent. The make-up of the board seemed unrelated to the setting of a meaningful agenda or the degree of satisfaction felt by the members. Effectiveness seemed to be related to other factors.

Generally, superintendents have wanted to be the spokespersons for their districts. To counter some of their time problems, two partnerships, **Utah** and **Washington**, have been successful in having assistant superintendents do much of the board planning and follow through, using a second-level leadership strategy.

Perhaps the most significant and frequently discussed organizational issue related to the placement and expectations for the executive director. Eleven of the directors have a higher education appointment and/or work out of an office located in an institution of higher education, two come from the K-12 sector and one is outside of both systems. There was general agreement among the respondents, regardless of which segment of education they represented, that the executive director needs to be seen as a member of the higher education community if the partnership is to have any chance of impacting the university world. As one director said, "What's important for higher education is prestige, clout, and academic credentials!"

Being in the university is not enough in the minds of those directors in that arena. To really get faculty involvement and support, one needs to be in a line position as close to the dean as possible. It is even stronger, they say, when the position can be seen as carrying out the wishes of the dean, provost, and/or the president. Taken from this

viewpoint, few of the directors can be said to be operating from a position of power in their university placement. In two universities, **Arizona and Michigan State**, the directors hold appointment as an Assistant Dean and there was no question of the advantage of this placement to the partnership. In addition, in each case the dean was very supportive and this fact was well-known and important to the faculty. One of the directors in higher education, and a person who was well supported by his dean, made the observation that one of the serious problems in the fourteen partnerships is that "most of the directors were on the margin in their respective systems."

Internally, there is another dimension to be considered in the university placement. Ann Lieberman, Executive Director of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium, observes from her experience in the Metropolitan School Study Council (6, p. 75) that the placement of the director in a specific department, such as Curriculum and Instruction or School Administration, can have significant implications in terms of which staff and graduate students participate in the partnership. As she reports, the students in Curriculum and Instruction tended to go on to be assistant superintendents for curriculum or professors of curriculum and instruction and those coming out of Administration became principals or superintendents. This appeared to be the situation in two of the partnerships.

In one instance, the executive director directs the Curriculum Department and the partnership appeared to have limited involvement with those programs and faculty members in the Administration Department and the remainder of the School of Education. In another case, the executive director is located in the Department of Administration and expressed a reluctance to make any demands on other faculty in the school of education in respect to the needs of the partnership.

Two other partnerships appear to have resolved the potential for a separation between the Curriculum and Administration departments. In one institution, the departments were combined into a single unit, the Department of Educational Leadership. In the second case, the faculty member, as director of the partnership, was given a joint appointment between the two departments to avoid this problem.

With the thrust of the partnerships to date being the education of educators, most have seen the placement of the directorship in the dean's office as the most desirable. However, the observations by one respondent outside the National Network but having experience in another type of a school-university partnership, takes the question of the placement of the executive director one step further. From this person's years as a director of an urban center program to encourage better minority attendance in high school and eventual enrollment and completion of university programs, it was his feeling that the partnership would fall short of reaching its potential until the director's duties were placed with a position of university-wide leadership.

For him, the assignment of the partnership function to a key university level administrator having other responsibilities had many advantages. As Vice-President for Academic Affairs, it was possible, he said, to get Arts and Sciences people, as well as those in the School of Education, involved in this particular student retention project. Questions involving curriculum and admission standards could be dealt with, "because the Partnership Director sat on the Core Curriculum Committee of the University. Even if left with the Dean of the School of Education, the program would never have worked."

A number of the respondents felt the important ingredient in moving the partnership was the availability of the executive director for full-time commitment to the endeavor. Only four directors reported that most of their time was given to directing the partnership. Some had half-time assignments to head the partnership, and some directors carried almost a full load of responsibilities in addition to serving as director. Undoubtedly the time available for the director to function as director comes to be a factor in the effectiveness of the partnership, but the placement of the director in the higher education hierarchy must be considered the critical part of the equation.

The placement of the director's position is not unrelated to the question of the expectations for the director. In many of the partnerships, respondents said they thought the director should be a good facilitator or coordinator. Even though this sounds like a more limited job description, it carries with it an expectation for having ready access and time to relate to faculty members, key actors in the partnership

units, and the superintendents and university administrators. Access means acceptance and credibility and, to that end, the opening statement relative to "prestige, clout, and academic credentials" may be the best descriptor for the qualities necessary to be an effective coordinator or facilitator.

Perhaps the best summary of the characteristics needed by a director is that provided by Paul H. Heckman in reference to his time with the Southern California partnership. He felt a partnership needed:

> ...to be directed by a tenured faculty member or a person recruited into a tenured position for this purpose. Such an individual would, however, have to be committed to the partnership concept and able to walk comfortably both sides of the 'fence' between university research and school practice." [And later] I was aware of my function as a broker of ideas and people - putting people in touch with one another around issues of common concern. (6, p.122)

Some of the executive directors do not appear to have been chosen and placed with a full understanding of the demanding task to be undertaken. To the extent this is unchanged, some partnerships are due to fall on hard times.

Fiscal problems were seldom mentioned as a significant factor retarding the effectiveness of a partnership. Undoubtedly dollars are more of a concern than this but there was a general feeling that when the program of the partnership was deemed to have value, monies were provided by the districts or the university to achieve the desired end. There was considerable variation in the annual budgets of the partnerships, but how the money was raised and the amounts involved are hard to correlate to the quality of the partnership programs. Two examples suggest this difficulty:

Michigan: Two programs took place involving elementary schools and Michigan State University. If one applied a criterion similar to the one used in this study, one would judge these two efforts to be very effective in changing a school and /or the teachers' methods within these schools. At the same time, these programs had an impact on the

preparation of candidates enrolled in teacher education programs. The cost was born largely by the faculty from the university in terms of their time and contribution being beyond their normal assignment. Likewise, the public school teachers stayed after school when necessary and got no extra money for their involvement. On paper, this would be a tremendously cost-effective program.

Washington: This partnership is one of the most heavily funded and involves an annual budget of approximately $250,000. The projects undertaken are generally given high marks by the participants but the specific classroom focus on improvement in schooling or the education of educators similar to what occurred in **Michigan** is lacking.

Dollar comparisons between the partnerships are difficult to make because of the differences in program and the great amount of 'donated' time provided in almost every partnership. There have been no direct grants from the National Network to the partnerships for their day-to-day operation. The Network has been helpful in off-setting the convening costs for an occasional meeting of the directors, but for the most part, each partnership has been on its own to fund the programs, staff, and studies it determines to be essential to the partnership effort.

Some universities have provided much of the direct financial support for the partnerships, often in the form of salary for the director, office space, and necessary secretarial help. Outside funding support has not been obtained by most partnerships. One major exception is **Massachusetts** where the Coalition received approximately $140,000, the largest single state grant of any awarded from a $5 million legislative appropriation to stimulate school-university relationships. These monies have been supplemented with foundation monies, and school districts in the Coalition have made relatively little financial contribution. A second is **Arkansas** where a similar amount of money has been received from a Winthrop Rockefeller Foundation grant. For the most part, however, partnerships have not drawn foundation or state support. Recent planning grant awards to some for Professional Development Schools suggest this may become more common in the future.

Several respondents suggested it was important to keep the local boards of education informed since there were budget implications looming on the horizon with new partnership proposals. A few governing

boards have kept the local boards well informed, but some have not and this is a worry to a number of the directors and governing boards. The same can be said regarding the flow of information to university presidents and higher education governing boards. The failure to keep any of these boards informed may come back to undermine the continuation of partnerships.

Two other operational problems should be noted. Respondents indicated that the selection of the initial school districts to participate in the partnerships was not done in a systematic manner and has led to a variety of problems. Sample comments include these:

> The original selection brought in some good schools. Since we really didn't have a process, we just chose the schools and some of the districts not chosen are still upset.

> One of the problems we've had is that we had an individual commit to the partnership - like a superintendent - but we didn't get an institutional commitment. Now that person's moved to another district.

> The selection of the districts was done through "the old boys' network" and we got some poor districts. When you're working with some poorly respected districts, it is hard to get acceptance for some of the ideas and innovations that have started to come from the partnership.

In addition to a faulty selection process, only one of the partnerships reported having a process for reviewing districts failing to be an active, contributing member of the unit. **Massachusetts** indicated it has a process for accepting, dropping, and adding districts. Of the thirteen without such a procedure, nine partnerships said it was a currrent problem and four said it had yet to come up as an issue.

Are task forces a meaningful strategy or a dead end? Half of the partnerships utilize task forces for the study of topics selected by the governing boards. In part, this resulted from following one of Goodlad's

recommended, mimimum essentials for operating a partnership. (6, p. 27 -28)

Some of the most popular task force topics include the at-risk child, the principalship, teacher education, and assessment practices. The evolvement of a task force followed a common pattern. The governing board considers the topics submitted from the districts and university involved. A few, usually no more than three, are found to be common to all of the lists and are selected for concentrated study by task forces. An equal number of representatives from each district and the university are appointed to each task force. The task force begins meeting and periodically reports back to the governing board. In the interim, special conferences are held and outside consultants are brought to the partnership as a part of the study and partnership activities for the year.

Except for some task force chairmen and participants, persons interviewed expressed almost a uniform dissatisfaction with the task force approach. Their comments were similar: Task forces are slow. They have problems with the turnover of key personnel. One superintendent reported that, "My task force representatives go to the meetings and wonder why they are there." A dean in the same partnership said, "Task forces have cut off our thinking." In this sense he was referring to the delegation of the key issues to task forces and taking the governing board out of the picture. This response pattern, with some exceptions, was the same across the seven units. The exceptions were the task force members themselves who felt the discussions were good, and they enjoyed the camaraderie.

The task force approach is to be differentiated from the meeting of colleague groups, i.e., elementary teachers and principals, secondary teachers and principals, superintendents, etc. These meetings appeared to have a discussion value to the participants, but the agenda was developed by the groups themselves and there was a sense of ownership in contrast to the task forces that were formed to achieve a partnership objective set by the governing board.

Perhaps the most contradictory aspect of the task force was the apparent impact it had on the school based involvement deemed by Goodlad to be such a desirable partnership factor. Once task forces

began working on a topic, the individual schools, as a unit, and the school district itself got little feed-back from the deliberations. If the task force reached a set of recommendations, often there was no base laid with the school or school district for their acceptance. The potential for school level change is minimal at best.

The task force approach appears to delay the consideration of a topic by a school or district member by at least two years - which appeared to be the minimum life of a task force. In some cases, task forces were still meeting after two years, had no timeline for reaching closure and reporting, and, essentially, had left "the high priority topic" in limbo. In one case, the governing board and the executive director ended an unproductive task force but had postponed doing so for some time because of the ill will it would generate.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Partnerships adopted a lot of the operational suggestions made by Goodlad, and most have worked out quite well. In other cases, the recommendations provided a starting point. Some approaches suggested did not work well, and with two years of experience by the partnerships, there is need for change. That is exactly what sharing through the National Network was to provide.

2. **Recommendation**: The current make-up of the governing boards for most partnerships is causing a concern. A broader, more representative group must be devised to provide for superintendents' involvement but allow an addition of some key members to expand the dialogue at the governing board level.

3. **Recommendation**: The operational suggestions for the partnerships should be amended to include recommendations for the best placement of the executive director. The initial set of operational suggestions did not deal with the question of the best placement for the executive director. The options should be carefully discussed, but the writer would suggest that the director should be located in the highest placement possible in the institution of higher education. Placement at the institutional level has the advantage of involving Arts and Sciences and this is a most important need. It is possible that little solid contact

is going to be made with secondary schools until key faculty from outside the school of education are brought into the discussions.

4. **Recommendation**: The operational guidelines should be amended to help partnerships to develop a systematic process for selecting members for the partnership and having a review period, at which time each member can be considered for continuation in or withdrawal from the partnership. Lacking such a process now, a number of units are 'hanging on' and not carrying their weight in the partnership.

5. **Recommendation**: Task forces as a strategy to attack partnership issues should no longer be recommended. Alternatives to cross district, long-term committees must be devised. Without streamlining the partnership approaches they will increasingly be bypassed as being too slow.

REACTIONS OF THE PARTICIPANTS TO THE CONCEPT AND EACH OTHER

It was Goodlad's hope that the university and the public school representatives could work together as *equal* partners. This is one of the basic principles separating the Goodlad Partnership Concept from other partnerships. Sirotnik and Goodlad realized the difficulty of this when it is "a form of institutional collaboration that rarely (if ever) has occurred in practice." (6, p.viii) The two cultures are very different in terms of the language, reward system, expectations, and the clientele.

Will the campus-based educator be the more reluctant participant of the two as Schlechty and Whitford suggest? (6, p.203) For the practitioner in the field there would seem to be every advantage in a partnership inasmuch as the K-12 arena is under the most strident attack. This is not the case with higher education. The two authors felt the campus-based educators might not rally behind such a concept when its most immediate end or necessity is that of enhancing the effectiveness of the school district personnel more so than the university staff member (6, p.202). When societal pressures come to bear on educators and education there is a tendency for those in the temple of education to criticize each other. Goodlad anticipated this and indicated that one of the basic needs of a partnership is for an

understanding that the partners "will eschew in their operations any search for persons or places for the affixing of blame." (6, p.25)

In consideration of these doubts, there is little wonder that Goodlad has chosen to refer to this as a 'social experiment,' for it may be that it is around the interface of the two parties that the success or failure of the concept revolves. The question may not be the validity of the goals, the ability to set a meaningful agenda, or resolution of organizational problems, but rather can the two parties get along in a productive, sharing, respectful relationship?

Findings:

K-12 Partnership Leaders Feelings About Higher Education

When the interaction between the two parties takes place in a campus classroom situation, the roles of the two are fairly well defined, understood, and accepted. One is a professor and one is a student. However, put these same parties in a situation where the two are expected to be *equal* partners in sharing problems, ideas, and aspirations, and the normal role parameters are gone. The feelings of a student-teacher relationship remain, however, and a new set of roles and expectations are demanded. Add to these basic psychological challenges the coming together of persons from two very different work settings, and the concept of a social experiment is perhaps better understood.

A number of public school respondents spoke of the difficulty in making this transition. They said that the first very real obstacle to sitting in a partnership relationship as equals was learning to sit at the table with persons like the ones who had graded you or served as your adviser in college. While individuals in the public schools spoke of this as a problem, only a few university personnel mentioned this role change as a factor in the relationship. Was it more of a factor than the higher education representatives wanted to admit? Despite the apparent one-way concern, the writer felt the dynamics of the partners coming together as equals was an important consideration to be recognized by the parties. Although avoided by most partnerships, there were some approaches observed that confirmed the existence of these feelings

while affirming that the uneasiness and doubts could be eased by university initiative.

University personnel coming to the public school and becoming involved in the life of the school was the most persuasive action taken to overcome suspicions about the sincerity of higher education. In **Michigan** and **Massachusetts,** the professors came to the schools and became very visible to the principals and staff members. In one elementary school in East Lansing, Michigan State professors had a special room in the school. Faculty members came there to work with student teachers but the regular school staff knew they could sit in on the discussions and that some of the activities were planned for them as well. In Massachusetts, one school reported that the University of Massachusetts staff from Amherst came to the school to substitute so the elementary staff could observe programs elsewhere. In these two sites there was no hesitancy to commend university personnel and express appreciation for the relationship that had developed.

The reverse action was taken in **Wyoming, Maine,** and **Utah**. Here the universities invited school staff members to meet with university personnel to make major changes in preparation programs. Wyoming hosted the teachers on campus for several days while the faculty and public school teachers discussed the teacher preparation course content and sequence in great detail.

At a lesser level, public school personnel reported feeling appreciated by higher education because of the arrangements made for them in school-university discussions. The Director and other university officials carefully structured activities to communicate the intent of higher education to be an equal partner. The signalling of this intent was done sometimes in small ways but was not missed by K-12 participants. As one principal reported, "We were invited to the campus for dinner. They put tablecloths on the dining room tables and even served us wine!"

In those partnerships where a breakthrough had taken place, it was common for the school people to indicate that "in the early stages higher education controlled. There was no sharing." With time, it appears that this transition from doubt to trust can take place. Although still a

concern in probably half of the partnerships, only four of these appear to have a serious problem.

There is value in probing this issue more deeply. In these four cases, attention must be given to addressing this division before the partnership activities can be productive. From the interviews, the writer would conclude that both parties in such a situation have responsibility for overcoming these feelings. There is need for public school people to be willing to bring this item to the table for discussion if the partnership is to have any potential for survival and growth. There were negative comments in most of the states but those from governing board members and others in these four units were particularly sharp and consistent. Some examples:

"University professors are smug."

"Teacher ed institutions are really out of it." (In regard to the reform movement in that state)

"Teacher Ed - and Higher Ed in general - is not helpful. They're indifferent. My goal is to get a working relationship with higher education in three to five years. Won't be easy."

"I came here hoping to talk about improving teacher education. It hasn't come up. There's no partnership."

"Teacher Ed's approach in the field is not friendly or even cordial. They are too narrow to be helpful."

"We feel profs are theoreticians. They think we're bumbling oafs."

If partnerships are like marriages, as Goodlad has suggested (9, p.77), these marriages would be sure candidates for the divorce court - and for somewhat the same reason. These rather deep feelings were not being dealt with at board meetings or even in private meetings with the university leaders. Several said they knew reconciliation had to start with honest communication but did not know how to start it.

From university respondents, some common patterns emerged. There was a frequent recognition that teacher education practices could not improve without significant discussion with K-12 leaders. A number of higher education personnel said they were sure they had learned more from the relationship than the public school people. Several deans said it was critical to have a partnership operating since the biggest problem in teacher education was a "realistic placement" for

student teachers and this problem could only be solved with K-12 involvement. The positive remarks far outweighed the negative although there were some interesting responses here as well:

> Our university faculty gets depressed with the dialogue and the unprofessional attitudes they find in public schools and particularly in the faculty lounges. Hard to get my people to go out.
>
> Superintendents are so restrained by laws and tradition. I'm not sure they have anywhere to go after these meetings.
>
> K-12 always wants quick fixes - the Madeline Hunter variety. They are not in this for the long term changes that are necessary.

In one partnership, right after hearing from superintendents serving on the governing board that teacher education should be one of the high priorities of the partnership, the writer interviewed the dean of the university, who said:

> K-12 doesn't see teacher education as a high priority. It's not really their business anyway, but I would be willing to talk about it.

Respondents at all levels talked about the problem of the university reward system working against those wishing to work with the public schools. This was felt to be particularly true for the non-tenured faculty member who needed to be active in writing and research. In fact several university faculty members mentioned that a non-tenured professor should not get involved with the partnership activities and that tenured personnel were going to have to 'carry the ball.'

Deans generally conceded partnership involvement meant something to them, but agreed that university tenure and promotion committees consistently ignored this part of the vita. In one interview the dean reported that this pattern had been broken just recently. One faculty member, who had worked extensively with an elementary school math

class near campus, was awarded tenure, and the school involvement was seen as a plus by the promotion committee.

Presidents in two large universities were asked if the promotion concern was a valid one from their perspective. Each replied that the involvement in the schools would be a negative factor for most tenure and promotion committees, although each said it would be a positive activity from his viewpoint. One of the leaders said it was not just a problem for faculty in the school of education but would be true, too, for any of the professional schools. "Activities in the field do not count for much. They are seen as low priority by university committees." He added that there was an intrinsic return to the professor, however, through the publication of articles, presentations at AERA, and the value of the experience itself.

While most respondents were focusing on changing the reward system to get faculty to be more serious about participation in the partnership, one dean raised the importance of rewarding a dean who supports a partnership, becomes active in the field, and by so doing, sends a message to the faculty about the importance of partnership involvement.

A considerable difference of opinion surfaced over the readiness and availability of faculty from the Arts and Sciences. It was commonly felt by School of Education faculty members that Arts and Sciences people would be the least likely to avail themselves of the opportunity to participate in a partnership. University-wide officials, however, felt Arts and Science members were more willing to work in the schools than education faculty. Public school personnel reported successful contacts with Arts and Science professors because they were brought in to help on secondary content issues, discussions regarding values in our society, or the role of economics (to cite a few specific uses). There was considerable indication that the availability of Arts and Sciences faculty was being misjudged by school of education personnel.

Several partnership directors indicated that university faculty members generally need assistance in working with the public schools. As one director put it, "You can't ask them to do something they can't do." This same director had made personal contacts with faculty members he judged to be open to involvement and asked each what it would take to

get them involved in the partnership. This degree of contact is at least one means of achieving wider involvement by university faculty members. Several university respondents said that this is so critical to the partnership and the university as a whole, that a university liaison ought to be appointed, in addition to the campus based director. This person could be used, they thought, to boost awareness and participation across the entire university community - not just the school of education.

From the comments of those university personnel interviewed, only four of the fourteen partnerships have any significant participation by the university faculty. Of the ten identified as being less involved, several faculty were said by the deans to be outwardly opposed to the partnership concept. The writer interviewed one such faculty member holding a very key position in the school of education. His comments were candid:

> The partnership concept will not be a means of reform. The two groups (schools and universities) are too disparate. To come together would require too much compromise for the good of either party. In the end, individuals are the spark for change. It's the credibility of individuals that is important. Partnerships are not necessary for ongoing change.

Another, somewhat less critical of the partnership concept, said:

> Higher education needs to be threatened before you'll see any real commitment or involvement.

While these were minority opinions in terms of this study sample, they may be more typical of perceptions held by faculty members overall. With school personnel, the opinions were more uniformly supportive of the concept, but three themes emerged from a few interviews that may be reflective of more broadly held concerns:

> The partnership moves too slowly for a district to rely on it for solution to the pressures we come

> under." (Superintendent and Governing Board member questioning his continuation as a partnership member).
>
> The partnership has the danger of limiting the district in its search for a solution or a resource person. I'm used to using people from a variety of universities - many of them outside the state. I don't want to feel limited to the faculty at this state university only. (Superintendent)
>
> The partnership itself has not meant that much to my district, but I've gotten acquainted with the dean through the meetings and I've gone directly to him and some of his staff for assistance. I've bypassed the partnership but it worked. (Superintendent)

A final, more basic challenge came from some of the public school participants. "Why was the state university selected as the institution for involvement in a partnership when it is the least responsive of our teacher preparing units?" The answer, the writer would assume, would flow from Goodlad's belief that university involvement had the potential of providing both the teaching and the research capability necessary for advancing the state of the art. Persons in the field held a different point of view.

Summarizing their statements, four themes seem to be repeated. Individuals cited the fact that in their case the involved university produced less than ten percent of the teachers graduating each year from the state's colleges and universities. Second, teacher education was not a primary mission of the university like it was at other institutions in the state and this factor was more important than trying to bring in the research potential. Third, the university had an image of being the least responsive and monolithic in its operation of any of the higher education institutions in the state. Last, if the partnership ideas worked at the university, there was still a problem of transferring these to broader practice within a state and particularly to those institutions responsible for a greater percentage of teacher education candidates.

While it was beyond this study to examine this issue in depth, it is probably fair to ask in regard to advancing the partnership concept overall, would the results after two or three years have been different if the partnership had been developed with the institution in each state most involved with the preparation of teachers? If the partnership idea is expanded, should teacher education institutions or colleges having less complex governance patterns be brought into the partnerships?

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. There were strong, latent, negative feelings among many of the practitioners in respect to higher education. When dealt with, almost in dramatic form in some cases, (a university room in a public school, professors teaching in a school so staff could observe a special program, or school people invited on campus for extensive program evaluation meetings with university faculty), these feelings can be and were turned around.

2. One of the driving forces for Goodlad in establishing the Network was a sense of urgency based on what he perceived to be a need to reverse a deteriorating public school situation. Few people at any educational level brought this level of concern to the partnership mission. While many were motivated to make the concept work as a vehicle for achieving needed change in teacher education and the public schools, the continued existence of public education was not felt to be the issue.

3. **Recommendation**: Before an institution of higher education enters into a partnership, discussions should be held with the institutional leadership to gain a commitment for partnership involvement by a faculty member to carry with it some potential recognition in the institutional reward system. At a minimum, the disincentives for faculty members to participate should be eliminated.

RESEARCH AND INQUIRY: THE MISSING INGREDIENTS

The key to the renewal of a school in Goodlad's schematic is "a core of teachers and the principal engaged continuously in inquiry about the nature, quality, and relevance of the educational enterprise in which they

are engaged (6, p.16)." He felt this to be one of the central learnings from his initial work with schools in Atlanta. His subsequent experiences served only to strengthen this belief.

The partnership added another dimension to this pursuit of inquiry. Goodlad suggests that school-university collaboration brings together the instructional, curricular, and organizational improvement agenda of the schools with the teacher education and research programs in schools of education. It was this combination that Goodlad thought would bring about a "potentially powerful partnership (6, p.21)." There was a specific corrective contribution he saw emerging from the establishment of a partnership. Goodlad believed that it took the action oriented school environment joining with the reflective, "inquiry-oriented culture of the university" to shake "loose the calcified programs of both." (6, p.21)

With these expectations in mind, Goodlad puts forth one very key assumption for the partnerships: "Each partnership is to be characterized by an efficient and effective sharing of information and knowledge, either produced by its members or coming from other sources." (6, p.24)

There is an implication in all this that it would be this aspect of the partnership that would have an appeal to a research oriented institution like a university. With the stated university mission being one of research, teaching, and service, it was a logical expectation.

One further clarification should be noted. In keeping with the sense of partnership and common effort, Goodlad advocated for "collaborative inquiry" as opposed to a pure research model. School people were not expected to stand aside while the researchers used their schools and classrooms to conduct the classic experimental/control group studies. School personnel were seen as being active participants in defining the problem, collecting the information, interpreting the findings, and developing change strategies based on the insights emerging. It's a model, sometimes described as "interactive research", that is discussed very effectively by Clark (6, p.49-52) and Lieberman (6, p.79-80). It was this collaborative research approach that Goodlad saw as a natural evolution for a partnership and was the topic of inquiry in this study.

Findings

Six partnerships showed elements of interactive research or were at least giving the idea a place in partnership planning and discussion. There was little evidence that this component of a partnership was accepted or being seriously considered by the remaining eight.

The participating schools in the **Massachusetts Coalition** joined with university personnel to study school issues identified by the teachers and principals. Through these collaborative efforts, these data were analyzed and interpreted. Corrective actions were developed and implemented, and follow-up studies were made in respect to the actions taken. Graduate students and professors used these studies for their dissertations and American Educational Research Association publications. Teachers reported an excitement in working through the process and graduate students rated the experience as one of the high points of their professional career.

The reports from the staff members in the **Michigan** studies were similar. Professors became active in the life of the school. They helped in assessing teaching strategies and behavioral changes needed by the school staff. A real sense of searching and testing was reported by public school staff members who said they thought, by virtue of their age, they were beyond this level of excitement!

In **Maine** there was discussion of "action research" by some schools and a greater emphasis is planned for the coming year. While the enthusiasm of school faculties seemed high for this endeavor, there was little indication that these feelings were as readily accepted by university staff other than those assisting with the partnership.

Under the leadership of Governor Gardner in **Washington,** the legislature established a concept of Schools for the 21st Century. (11,p.10) Some schools in the Puget Sound Educational Consortium made application for this program and the possibility developed that faculty members from the University might join with these schools in researching the results of the multi-year effort. This was seen as a potential "door opening" opportunity. The existence of the partnership allowed for this combining of forces, but it took an outside stimulus to trigger the effort.

The situation in **Utah** was somewhat similar. Although there was reference to past collaborative studies, currently the only interaction was between a Brigham Young University faculty member and school districts in the partnership in "evaluation" undertaken in response to either a state legislative study requirement or a 'crisis' in one of the individual districts. Support was voiced for the interactive research model, but no partnership plans were evolving from this interest.

State officials in **Hawaii** cited the research contributions of the Curriculum and Research Unit at the University and the importance of work done by the evaluation staff at the Kamehameha Schools. These units were in place prior to the establishment of the Hawaii School/University Partnership. It was not clear that the partnership concept had furthered collaborative inquiry. Given the existence of these two established research sources, the Hawaiian partnership research evolvement may be different, and in fact should be, than that developed in the other thirteen partnerships. At this point, however, there was little evidence of the inquiry based approach being seen as a critical component in planning the partnership program.

The absence of the research and inquiry factors became a major part of the interviews as the study progressed. Although missing, they were a topic of conversation by individual respondents, and, in one case, became a focus of an exchange at a governing board meeting attended by the writer. This particular discussion is illustrative of the frustrations expressed in this and other partnerships.

The subject of research in the partnership had risen when the Dean of the School of Education advanced the notion of applying for federal project monies contained in newly passed legislation. This led to an exchange regarding the possibility of participating in additional federally sponsored research programs.

A member of the group asked about greater involvement in research without the federal programs. Several of the school district members cited examples of very helpful research arrangements experienced with higher education institutions in other states.

The Dean reminded them that research costs money. He said he would be glad to pursue this if the board members wanted to invest some dollars. Without this commitment, he indicated they might be able to get

the research assistance of a graduate student occasionally, but that professors would want to be paid for their involvement.

The conversation moved to another topic.

It would be a mistake to feel the absence of research related only to the partnerships in the fourteen states. Research was considered to be at a low ebb in almost every state visited. When asked about the status of educational research in his state, one state official responded, "Right now research in this state is deplorable." There is a broader problem within universities, therefore, that needs to be examined as one considers the dearth of research in the partnerships. It is an ironic one, given the exent to which schools of education require faculty members to publish in order to gain promotions.

Despite the rhetoric regarding "research universities," one could conclude from the responses this writer received that research is not actively pursued by large numbers of faculty in many of the schools of education of these select institutions. Deans and others cited a decline in the availability of federal and foundation grants for research purposes. Regardless of the cause, one would conclude from these discussions that the spirit of inquiry is not running rampant on major university campuses waiting to be channelled to worthwhile efforts defined by school districts, partnerships or society as a whole. This overriding impression needs to be inserted here to give perspective to the absence of research directly tied to the fourteen partnerships. There is a lack of commitment to serious inquiry that needs to be explored, a lack that is strikingly apparent when one considers the need for research on school problems.

In regard to the relationship of research and the partnerships, several explanations were advanced for the failure of this conceptual element to develop. Some of the reasons suggested were personal:

-Higher education fears this and other interactions. It becomes a threat. The faculty needs to keep a distance from school districts to maintain the higher education "mystique." (Higher education faculty member)

-Some of the faculty may feel they escaped K-12 classrooms. Why go back? This is really a state policy issue and needs to be faced. (Higher education official)

-A few university staff suggested the research decline had come because research findings are not valued or used by public school personnel. One higher education spokesman said his university had decided to play down research discussions because it turned public school teachers off.

Two university respondents discussed this problem at great length and offered pertinent insight into the broader problems of educational research as well as the partnership void the writer was pursuing.

The Partnership Director at Claremont Graduate School and a Brigham Young University faculty member felt the low priority given to qualitative research by the university personnel committees, AERA, and the research journals contributed a great deal to qualitative, school level studies being considered as 'second-class' research. The professional preference, from their experience, was for the shorter term, quantitative type study that was considered to be data based and therefore more objective.

The implications of this preference were significant, they felt, in that the qualitative approach and the collaborative or interactive research model being proposed for the partnerships by Goodlad faced an uphill battle for acceptance among the university community. Both felt the assumptions under which the quantitative approach operated were in direct conflict with the participatory, observational techniques felt by Goodlad to be the basis for school renewal.

Right or wrong, the perception of faculty members on the campus appeared to support the above comments. As one faculty member said:

"I did quantitative work for my dissertation and pre-tenure experience. Now that I'm on tenure I can do qualitative research."

Given the frequency of these comments it appears to be a substantive issue and one that is resolvable if the **Massachusetts** and **Michigan** approaches are looked at as possible models. The experiences of these two partnerships would indicate the value and satisfaction Goodlad predicted from collaborative research can in fact be achieved. It would appear, too, that the costs were not extensive.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The interactive research proposals for the partnerships have not received significant attention in most of the partnerships. The reasons given vary but the writer believes it stems from a broader failure to internalize inquiry and self-correction as a critical, organizational responsibility of schools and universities generally.

2. **Recommendation**: As a part of an annual review by a partnership, school districts and the university should list their research needs and interests. By placing this item on the table once a year, members would be stimulated to define their needs and engage in conversation over their validity and the possible means of researching these matters.

3. **Recommendation**: Once potential research needs are identified and validated, other resources beyond the partnership should be pursued. For example: Districts themselves may collaborate to conduct such studies. Second, twenty percent of the administrative allocations to states under Chapter Two of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 must now be used to advance the concept of effective schools. This equates to approximately $20 to $25 million nationwide. Some of the partnership proposals might well relate to the state's interest in school based models. The important first step is identifying the need.

4. **Recommendation**: The different perceptions regarding the qualitative-quantitative research issue need to be clarified within each of the higher education insititutions working with a partnership. Once established, the institution's position on this matter should be communicated to the school district members. Beyond, resolution of this in each partnership, there is need for the Network itself to consider the problem and become an advocate, if necessary, for greater status of qualitative research as a base for supporting nationally the concept of interactive research.

Chapter Four
NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

It would do the partnership concept a disservice if a judgment were made of the National Network and its mission apart from broader educational developments occurring nationwide. The intent of the Network is to have the sixteen institutions of higher education and over one hundred school districts working on topics and ideas that will improve educational practices and stand as a model for the thousands of schools and school districts outside of the Network. To be truly valued, the partnerships must be seen as confronting the major issues of the day and providing directions that would not emerge otherwise. It is said that "timing is everything." When one looks at the partnerships in light of the developments in 1988, one would have to feel the emergence of the Network could not have had better timing.

Had the National Network begun earlier in the 1980's, it would have been in a philosophical and political conflict with the reform mood of the first half of the decade. The April 1983 report, A Nation At Risk (2), made a significant impact on the educational direction taken in the fifty states. For the better part of three years following the release of this report, states seemed to compete with one another to get reform legislation on the books. Assessment and graduation requirements dominated the legislative discussions. The targeting of student performance proposals soon expanded to include prospective teachers, and, in some acts, even currently employed teachers. Career ladder pay plans were debated. It was a time for legislated change and a high point for a general disparagement of educators.

Local public school policymakers and leaders were inundated with new regulations. Their involvement in guiding or even assisting in the selection of the agenda topics was for the most part minimal. Legislators drew ideas from a multitude of national reports, and educators were increasingly bypassed in favor of advice from state legislative and executive staff members as well as national organizations such as the National Governors' Association, the National Council of State Legislators, and the Education Commission of the States.

Five years later, the legislative emphasis has shifted across the country. There is some reassessment by legislators on the mandated approaches as a solution to some of the deeper concerns felt for the educational system. Likewise, many of the professionals have begun to understand the depth of the public concern for the schools. What has been referred to as the 'first wave' of reform has given way to a very different but continuing momentum. The partnership concept might have been terribly out of place in the years immediately following the Nation at Risk report. It may have a reception today as a change model because different questions are being asked and the locus of attention seems to be drawn more and more to the school and the classroom.

1988 Legislative Impressions

The statutory acts dealing with testing, graduation standards, teacher education requirements, and pay for performance are basically in place in states or they have been relegated to a lower priority. Major, comprehensive legislative packages, such as those passed in Texas and South Carolina, are not appearing with such regularity. In part, the general economy has caused a slowdown in any measures requiring new monies. Beyond that, however, the focus has come to be on changing the organization or the system itself as a means of raising the quality of student performance.

In the fourteen states visited, nine legislative sessions were dominated by school finance debates. In **New York, Massachusetts**, and **California** the news was not good (12, p.10). Major deficits developed and threatened the funding of previously passed reform legislation. **Utah** and **Wyoming** were struggling with an economic slowdown affecting the entire Rocky Mountain area. **Colorado** was in the process of adopting a new school finance formula with concern for the availability of revenues for implementing the act past 1989.

In **Hawaii** and **Virginia** the situation was much more positive with the latter increasing its state appropriation by more than sixteen percent in 1988(13, p.1). **Michigan** continued its upbeat economic outlook but made no major shift in its school finance pattern. Overall, while there was some new money in selected states, most states tried to fulfill legislative commitments made in earlier years and maintain

existing funding levels with some small increases provided. Few new proposals involving new money found their way through the legislative process (13, p.1-2).

This pattern is predicted to continue (13, p.1-2). Youth at risk and early childhood education are perhaps the only two topics drawing much additional legislative support. But beyond these areas, two trends seem to be developing that suggest legislative thinking.

First, legislators have begun to endorse school restructuring plans as the centerpiece of a state's reform movement. In **Massachusetts** the legislature and the Commissioner of Education established "Carnegie Schools" to demonstrate the practices called for in A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century(14). When the legislature established the "Schools for the 21st Century" project, **Washington** saw 135 schools seek to become one of the twenty-one units selected for pilot programs (11, p.10). **Arkansas**, through the Governor's office and the Department of Education, established a Restructured School Project to encourage school redesign ideas. **Colorado** combined the school finance changes with a major section in the new law requiring greater school level planning. In **Maine**, the State Superintendent found support for her proposals for school restructuring as one of the state goals.

Second, according to a report at the 1988 summer Education Commission of the States meeting (15), eighteen states have shown more than mild interest in the concept of parent choice. Governor Rudy Perpich and the Minnesota legislature have implemented legislation to give each parent the chance to enroll his/her child in a public school of choice - within or outside the district of residence (13, p.2 and 5). Its relevance to site based management was underscored when Governor Perpich indicated parent choice injects the 'market place approach' as a way of moving to a higher level of quality. He argued persuasively that choice presses all schools to make change - either in working to hold students that might leave or to attract new students to the school(15).

In summary, there appears to be little new money in the offing, but a growing legislative and executive interest in two school level approaches to stimulate a search for a higher quality of curriculum and instruction.

Professional Level Developments

As indicated, public school and higher education staff were asked to identify some of the major educational issues in their immediate area or the nation as a whole. This proved to be a revealing inquiry. The results were not necesarily positive in terms of the current operation of the partnerships because in many cases the concerns of the respondent were not reflected in the program and agenda of the partnership. However, three topics, the third being an item that probably would not have been there five years ago, consistently received comment:

1. Better teaching strategies and school programs for the at-risk student was mentioned in almost every partnership. At-risk was broadly defined. The descriptor included what was described as a growing number of students with serious problems who are not eligible for special education programs but have to be served in a classroom setting that has an ever widening spread of student characteristics and abilities.

2. Improvement of teacher education programs and increasing the opportunities for teacher renewal were needs mentioned in every partnership. In the higher education interviews, the need to establish realistic placements for teachers and principals in preparation programs was cited as a high priority in seven of the partnerships.

3. Restructuring of the individual school was cited as a high priority topic but respondents came at it in very different ways. Central office leaders were not as consistently supportive of the concept as principals and teachers - although some of the latter also saw problems in decentralizing some decision making to the building level.

Cited fewer times, but still an issue brought up in at least half of the partnerships were the topics of testing and assessment, instruction and motivation in the secondary schools, and the restraints to change caused by bargaining agreements.

An indication of the shift that has taken place in the last five years would be the statements coming from the annual conferences of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers held this summer (1988). There has been considerable movement by these powers on the topic of school restructuring (16, p.16-17). The NEA proposal calls for at least one school district in each state to take the lead, in cooperation with its teachers, in re-examining traditional school concepts. The American Federation of Teachers, one

of the early advocates for creating innovative schools, has formally established a Center for Restructuring and devotes its publication, Radius, to a bimonthly review of the emerging practices and policy issues in regard to restructuring proposals. (17)

The Education Commission of the States has made a major commitment to develop linkages between state officials and schools involved in the Coalition of Essential Schools. The project, Re: Learning, seeks to draw the schools working with Ted Sizer of Brown University and author of Horaces's Compromise: the Dilemma of the American High School, "into a relationship with the mainstream of a state's educational effort (18). Significantly, ECS has made this project one of its major priorities for the next three years. Re:Learning brings the concept of restructuring of schools even closer to the thinking of governors and legislators.

From a professional standpoint, the September 18, 1987 letter of President Donald Kennedy of Stanford on behalf of thirty-seven presidents and chancellors meeting earlier at the Spring Hill Conference Center in Minnesota should be noted as a major higher education statement (19). After what one of the respondents and a Conference participant called "a great silence from higher education on the subject of reform," this statement appeals to the college and university presidents across the country to:

> ...think more deeply about the manifold connections between our institutions and the schools, and act together as persistent and passionate advocates for reform. (19, p.1)

Last, the Holmes Group, a group of deans representing some of the most prestigious teacher education institutions in the country from the standpoint of their commitment to research and teacher preparation, has moved that group's dialogue to a specific program to establish Professional Development Schools in every state during the 1990's. In a May 1988 interview with the writer, Judith Lanier, the Dean of the School of Education at **Michigan State University** and a major force in the conceptualization of the group's work, reported that the Holmes Group is refining the Professional Development School proposal. A

series of six "think-tank" sessions are being held over the period of July, 1988 to January, 1990 to define what "Tomorrow's Schools" or "Schools of 2000" should look like as a first step to developing the preparation program neccessary to train those who will be staffing these units.

From interviews with deans, even those who chose not to join the Holmes Group, it appeared that several of the universities in the partnerships were attracted to the development of a Professional Development School, which is described as a center in which universities and schools work together in research and demonstration efforts to promote effective school practices and preparation programs. Six of the deans reported faculty discussions of this concept and indicated that this was emerging as a school of education focus in the coming years. Few universities had talked extensively with their school district partners but some conversations had been held and more were planning to pursue the topic this fall. The Ford Foundation's planning grants have given an impetus to this project.

For once, the professional and legislative trains seem to be running parallel. There is a common interest in school based decision making and flexibility. This unusual alignment should help professionals to respond in a more enlightened manner when, and if, legislative proposals are drawn for school level change. Two of the professional proposals, the Spring Hill statement of the presidents and the Holmes Group plan for Professional Development Schools, call for a school-higher education coalition. Proposals from the two union groups and project Re:Learning would not require collaboration.

For the partnerships, this means that one of the two purposes - the improvement of schooling - matches the current professional and legislative interests. This provides an opportunity to draw attention to any creative models and alternatives emerging from the partnership efforts. Conversely, it has the potential of demonstrating the inability of the profession to collaborate in the achievement of a generally accepted goal - absent a legislative stimulus or mandate.

Some have mistakenly sought to demonstrate that one plan, i.e., "The Carnegie Schools," is more desirable than the Coalition of Essential Schools or the Goodlad Partnership Concept. This is an unfortunate

debate. The real issue is: Can the system change by its own efforts? There is a belief among legislators, business officials, and perhaps some educators that system change can only be achieved through external intervention. Therefore, any of the current programs boosting school based change should be welcomed by all professional groups as an expression of a willingness to experiment and learn from such programs.

As to the second purpose of the partnerships - the improvement of the education of educators - there was little legislative action this year on the topic of staff development or teacher education programs. This could be a serious signal. To be ignored is sometimes more threatening than facing a direct confrontation. Professionals generally saw this as a major need. The comment was made by some key state leaders and others, that legislation may not be coming in the future since many governors and legislators have given up on teacher education. In those states where the state boards of education have responsibility for teacher certification and teacher education programs, there may be some relief expressed over the absence of redirection of legislative focus.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PARTNERSHIP CONCEPT AND EDUCATIONAL REFORM IN 1988

Where does the Goodlad Partnership Concept of college-university collaboration fit in light of the educational developments unfolding in the latter part of the 1980s? Can the National Network for Educational Renewal work or should a new direction be taken? Will the entrance of the college and university presidents make a difference in the effectiveness of the partnership concept?

A Common Agenda Item

The national focus on school level reform is a timely match with the partnership emphasis on the school as the basic unit of change. This bodes well for partnerships actively seeking school restructuring. The partnership should find a receptiveness for its efforts and be welcomed as a vehicle for change by school districts, state departments, legislators, and governors. Institutions of higher education should see a potential for working with schools in regard to the redesign of instructional strategies, curriculum, and school management practices. Along with changes such as these should come an obvious opportunity for "interactive research" in the manner advocated by Goodlad.

The congruence of purpose was not there in respect to the improvement of the education of educators - particularly if this is taken to mean campus based teacher education programs. The writer perceives a basic conflict here between the parties. A number of respondents in the public school and higher education sectors indicated a concern for the quality of new teachers coming into the field and the lack of meaningful renewal opportunities for experienced teachers. State officials and others concurred in this concern. The agreement ended at that point.

Higher education personnel tended to see the changes needed as being those in the campus programs, i.e., the adoption of a five-year program or a master's degree as a prerequisite to receiving a certificate.

In some cases there were proposals for improved supervision of student teachers. A different set of solutions came from those outside of higher education. Public school staff felt the schools ought to take greater responsibility for the student teaching experience followed by a more extensive induction time after initial employment. They supported the movement of prospective candidates to the field for work with mentor or master teachers as being a much better approach than extended campus time. State leaders and some of the legislative trends would support alternative routes to certification as a means of capturing the older, second career type person having a bachelor's degree at a minimum and wanting to secure a teaching certificate. They, too, felt that school districts should assume more of the pre-service responsibilities.

All this suggests that coming together for the purpose of an improved teacher preparation program may not have the same unity of interest and outside support as the focus on school based educational change. If this topic does not become a compelling agenda item for the partnership, then the problem of faculty motivation could become even more severe. This factor - motivation - is already in need of organizational nurturing in the higher education environment.

Can the Partnership Work?

The findings of this study would suggest some deep chasms between the schools and the teacher education worlds in the university. When the question is asked, "Can the two partners come together as *equal* partners?", one has to wonder if the parties can come together, period. There is a psychological block in terms of overcoming previous role relationships built on a student-teacher relationship, but there is more.

The pressures on the two are very too dissimilar. For example:

Public school pressures not felt by the teacher education world:

- Growing public and community pressures
- The press for other partnerships with business, community service groups, and parents
- A local board of education - for the most part an elected board - that brings an agenda and set of pressures to bear on the school personnel and the individual schools

- Collective bargaining agreements that impact the process by which problems are addressed and carry with them a tremendous time requirement
- A multi-faceted list of mandated, statutory duties
- In-service and staff development programs
- Daily schedules that are filled with school and district requirement that allow little flexibility for the incorporation of demands or activities outside the district and school arena
- Other like entities (elementary or secondary schools) that are close by and offer ready comparisons, and, in some cases, competition
- Students who are compelled to come to the classroom by compulsory attendance laws. Teachers face an ever widening band of student behavior and abilities. They are often seeking ideas and assistance.

It was anticipated that the higher education component would be the the more difficult culture to change. This was found to be true. It is what is not there in higher education that is the most important. There may be some pressure through the faculty evaluation process to show involvement and personal growth through professional activities, but there is little expectation for participation in a collective campus effort to improve the education of educators. It appears that the absence of any threat, the low public visibility, and an ill-defined and loose accountability process relative to the organizational effectiveness of the teacher education program work to thwart a motivation to participate as a true partner to improve educational quality. A creative tension and a sense of urgency are missing. There was an assumption that both parties would have a deep and common concern over the need to improve the quality of teacher education and teacher performance in the public school classroom. It was felt that this would be the point of a natural overlap of interests. This did not appear to be validated in the interviews.

The partnerships have tried to bring one culture - almost overloaded with societal demands - into a union with a culture that suffers from not having these same collective demands and resulting pressures.

The Goodlad Partnership Concept in this sense seems incomplete rather than wrong. What is missing is a recognition that some pressure for change and collaborative effort must be felt deeply by both parties

or the energies of either can be displaced easily by other priorities or indifference.

Having said all this, one has to go back to the idea that the partnership concept is working well in several instances. Why? For example, in the case of the **University of Wyoming**, the dean, with the support of the central administration, set a course to involve faculty members in successive meetings with public school teachers to improve the teacher education program. The endeavor became an expectation for the school of education. Time and resources were provided. This was a task the organization was committed to achieve. Likewise, at **Michigan State University** , the dean, bolstered by an institutional pattern of outreach, supported the development of alternative approaches in teacher education with public school personnel heavily involved. A number of faculty members see a partnership with public schools as the norm - part of the job of working at Michigan State University.

Using just these two examples, although there were others, the ingredients vital to an effective partnership are at least three:

Clear purposes - specific changes to be accomplished - are established for the school-university effort.

There is institutional support of the dean in establishing **an expectation** for involvement with the public schools to achieve these purposes.

There is a long range commitment by the institution to make collective involvement with the public schools **a norm** of faculty behavior.

For the reasons cited, most public school personnel enter the partnership with a basic motivation to participate. This feeling has to be generated also by the higher education institution. Unless there is a reasonable expectation that an institution will provide this setting, a school-university partnership should not be undertaken. For those institutions operating without this level of commitment in the National Network, and there were at least four where this appeared to be a serious deficiency, discussion of the value of continuing the partnership should be made the first order of business. A

recommendation was made in respect to a more careful selection of school districts and the need to establish a periodic review relative to districts continuing the partnership relationship. The same care should be taken in selecting the participating institution of higher education and providing a point of review for that partnership member as well.

The writer made a point of contacting others who had considerable experience with partnership efforts. These contacts confirmed the sophistication of the Goodlad Partnership Concept in comparison to other school-university models. They also reinforced the findings in regard to the difficulties in achieving successful collaborations. The Chief State School Officers, with the support of the Mellon Foundation, operated a school-university program for more than three years. The observations of the director, Rebecca Yount, were not unlike the opinions of the writer and many of the respondents in the study. She felt, after the three years of participation by those selected for the project, that they had "barely scratched the surface" in terms of what could be accomplished. While she was encouraged with several of the outcomes achieved, she felt there was "a wide gap between the two worlds." She indicated that in her judgment the groups avoided the major issues. From her experience, K-12 staff members were much more open while higher education contacts were more closed, and in some cases, almost hostile when the subject of higher education change was discussed. Her explanations for this reaction included these:

- Higher education did not have to face the diverse clients encountered by the public school representatives
- Higher education is still at the conscience raising level
- In higher education there is need for some motivating force - otherwise there is no pressure for any serious participation.

Another insightful voice, and one with considerable experience in partnership endeavors, was that of Ed Meade, Chief Program Officer for the Ford Foundation. In one of his letters to the writer on this topic (20), he cites six categories of school and college collaboration. These range from The College Board Project Equality to weekend college sessions for high school students. Some were developed for purposes of

staff development while others revolved around research endeavors. For anyone interested in achieving a successful partnership and avoiding the common pitfalls, he succinctly summarizes several "problems" that in his judgment "seemed to be general regardless of the pattern:"

1. Lack of leadership and commitment from the top
2. Less clear and not agreed upon objectives
3. Lack of trust
4. Different bureaucracies and cultures
5. Different reward systems
6. Little attention to implications for the long term

Regardless of the nature of the partnership, there is a consistency running through these reactions and concerns and the findings presented relative to the Goodlad Partnership Concept. The combination of findings are cited to emphasize a very important point. Many of the problems reported in Chapter Three of this study are endemic to any partnership concept. They are not unique to any one institution. They are not presented here to discourage the establishment of partnerships. Their existence argues for the parties to develop a plan designed to counter the difficulties, and, most importantly, to engage in an honest discussion of how these barriers can be overcome.

There is general agreement that higher education poses more challenges to a partnership effort than the K-12 arena. For this reason, the Spring Hill Conference and the resulting Kennedy letter (19) became a key discussion piece during the study. The letter, commonly referred to as the Kennedy letter in recognition of Stanford President Donald Kennedy's signature on behalf of thirty-seven conference participants, has now been signed by over 200 presidents of major colleges and universities in the country. While it is too early to tell the depth of commitment indicated by the signatures, the emergence of this statement of intent could have a positive impact on the National Network and the concept of school-university partnerships.

Will the Entrance of the Presidents Make a Difference? The Kennedy letter not only has the potential of greater executive and institutional involvement, it also injects the sense of urgency felt to be lacking in the

higher educational contacts made for this study. The statement speaks to a "national emergency" and a recognition that "the task before us is enormous." It is a call "to make teaching a true profession." (19, p.1-2)

The general goals and responsibilities suggested for presidents in the Spring Hill letter are stated well and touch on some of the same purposes in the Goodlad concept:

1) Speak out on educational needs and problems
2) Collaborate with schools and school districts on mutual interests
3) Jointly work for the improvement of the education of teachers
4) Give stress to the recruitment of more minorities into education and
5) Work toward a true professionalism of all those engaged in teaching

With so many institutional leaders willing to sign the Spring Hill letter, this opens several possibilities. More colleges and universities could be looking to the establishment of a formal relationship with the school districts in their area in the coming years. The partnership experience of the National Network, as well as other patterns devised over the years, could be a valuable resource for such a scenerio. There would be adequate models for guidance to carry the participants through some of the systemic difficulties reported in this study.

In combination with this approach, a further follow-up of the Kennedy letter could be considered in states where conditions may be favorable to a more extended effort. A state policy could be adopted whereby the higher education institutions of a state are called on to seek a relationship with the public schools to attack the educational problems and needs of that state. This would underscore to governing boards and other state educational policymakers that this is more than a president's expectation - it is a need and policy of the state that such a collaborative effort take place.

The value of adopting a state policy establishing school-university partnerships as an operational mode for a state has several advantages. It would sanction higher education involvement in the schools, support the appropriateness of qualitative research, suggest that colleges and universities actively recruit faculty members committed to the

fulfillment of a partnership, and might even encourage an examination of personnel policies for the purpose of removing any disincentives that discourage faculty from working with public schools.

Further, a state policy tells all levels of education that the inter-agency cooperation being fostered now in the areas of health, social services, education, and institutions is expected to take place within education. Educators and education policymakers would earn several gold stars with state political leaders if they initiated such a policy. It is a current trend of government to pursue such relationships as a means of demonstrating to the taxpayer that the human services area is coordinating these programs in an ever increasing collaboration that streamlines the government's delivery of services.

The presidents have made a significant commitment on behalf of American higher education to raise the level of educational quality throughout the educational enterprise. The means of launching such a major task have yet to be defined, but this study of the National Network and the fourteen partnerships would suggest some of the following observations and recommendations that might be considered:

1. Extending a partnership beyond the school of education to a full involvement of the president's office makes a powerful statement regarding the mission of the institution and increases substantially the potential of drawing the other resources of the institution into the effort.

2. An institutional involvement, rather than one limited to the school of education or in some cases a department within the school, has the potential of having everyone but no one involved. For this reason it is crucial that the staff evaluation process, tenure and promotion committees, and recruitment commitments consider the school-university mission as a part of any deliberations. The presidential announcements have to be reinforced by the personnel policies of the institution. The same should be said in regard to the K-12 area although these issues have been much less of a problem for the public school partner.

3. The partnership director or the person responsible for acting on the Spring Hill objectives should be identified with the office of the

president, provost, or vice-president for academic affairs to give greater promise of implementing a total university involvement. Conversely, placement of the director outside of the locus of power in the higher education setting can be a major obstacle to the acceptance and effectiveness of a partnership.

4. The college or university Arts and Sciences program should be seen as an important contributor to the partnership if there is any chance of achieving change and any substantive breakthrough with secondary schools. To date most of the partnership programs have revolved around change in the elementary school. Educational partnerships must demonstrate their value in the secondary arena before their full credibility is established.

5. Each partnership should establish one or more demonstration sites that truly reflect some of the restructuring concepts being proposed. Particularly important is the need to establish pilot secondary and teacher education changes. Models within a partnership involving better student teacher placements, different school staffing patterns, altered time allocations, curriculum modifications, and/or greater flexibility and decision making at the school unit are needed badly. As **Arkansas** has discovered, it is not necessary for the partnership to create new restructuring patterns. That partnership has incorporated a Coalition of Essential Schools model and worked with the school based efforts initiated by the governor and department of education. These can provide the necessary experimental focus within the partnership. Pilots exhibit the element of inquiry and searching that becomes visible and reassuring to politicians and the public as well. Likewise, the absence of such efforts causes one to question the seriousness of the collaboration.

6. Publicly stated objectives, strategies, time lines, and progress reports by the participating governing boards and chief executives should become an important part of keeping the partnership on task and subjecting the endeavor to public review. While there was a lot of concern about informing teachers and faculty members of the partnership efforts, few respondents seemed to understand the symbolic importance of the collaborative endeavor to the major state policymakers, the public, and the media. In addition, public pronouncements regarding agenda topics are a good way of screening out the mundane. The key point here, however, is to stress the public policy significance of a decision by the leaders of public schools and higher

education to undertake a collaborative effort and the importance of announcing such a step with some degree of fanfare.

7. A partnership may be stronger by organizing around a college or university more heavily involved in teacher education programming than some of the universities currently participating in the existing fourteen partnerships. Research universities having few teacher education candidates may be utilized best in a coordinated state plan by assisting in the design and research of pilot programs undertaken by others within the state. It should not be assumed that the "flagship" institution will function effectively in the lead role in a partnership unless, as in the case of Wyoming and Hawaii, there is only one major university in the state.

8. Partnerships, if initiated broadly in a state, should be supported by the establishment of a state policy and structure that promotes the collaborative use of the educational resources of the state to advance the quality of educational services at all levels. Through the efforts of the Director of Professional Educational Development, **Maine** has such a plan for setting such a structure in place to facilitate K-12 and higher education interaction. While there is danger in too much structure, the existence of some framework can give the outcomes of the partnership a better chance of being integrated into the ongoing practices of the system.

Closing Comments

The Goodlad Partnership Concept has been personally attractive to the writer for some years. It provides a means of nurturing the creativeness of professionals at all levels to solve problems and to seek new approaches to enhance the learning of those we are charged to educate. The disappointments of the study came in realizing that many of the participants had failed to internalize the importance of the psychological, educational, and governance components of the concept.

Perhaps the concept requires a longer time for incubation. Perhaps the extent of the roadblocks was not fully appreciated by early advocates. The concept is one of the few approaches involving school-based change that seeks to combine both the emphasis on the school and enhancement of university preparation programs. But there are

elements of the concept working and it has in fact made a significant difference in the thinking and quality of operation of at least half of the partnerships. The idea is established, although rather tentatively in some states. The misfires and the gains made thus far can collectively provide guidance to a broader endeavor. It may be that the potentially significant step undertaken by the presidents of America's higher educational institutions is such an extension.

The Spring Hill statement opens the door to a coupling of the two concepts, if not in an operational sense at least in a combining of the experience of the fourteen partnerships with any follow-up planning and programming undertaken by the presidents. The involvement of the chief executive officer of the institution will give a much needed boost to any partnership concept.

There is an urgency suggested throughout this report that should not be missed. One of the points mentioned earlier in analyzing the differences in response between public schools and higher education related to the greater openness of the K-12 world to the public. There is no "higher education mystique" to ward off the critics.

However, as was pointed out by several state level respondents, governors and legislators are faced with an even greater exposure. In addition to dissatisfied school patrons that may lobby them from time to time, they are faced with the feelings of a group estimated to be three times the public school patron size: that being the general public that no longer has children in school. This part of the public sees only the annual tax obligations and on this basis challenges the effectiveness of the system - often with little direct knowledge but nevertheless with great intensity. This group provides the pressure for change in a manner not fully appreciated by K-12 staff (except for some administrators and board members) and even less so by higher education personnel not directly involved with the state legislative process.

As a result, state legislators often move into solutions that do not originate with the system itself. In fact, these political positions often carry with them a belief that the educational system is incapable of change from within, and their mission is to assist ignored clients.

The collaborative approach being proposed by the presidents and pushed for a number of years by Goodlad, is based on the belief that

substantial change can take place from within when the proper conditions are established to promote a self-renewing and self-correcting system. Perhaps it is a "rather deviant idea" and a "social experiment" that may not succeed. The problem may not lie in the partnership concept but rather with the leaders, who, in some but not all of the partnerships, have yet to internalize the crucial need for making this or some collaborative approaches work, lest the control of education shift even more to the legislative halls.

With the entrance of the presidents, assuming the Spring Hill statement carries with it a serious commitment, there may be hope yet that the major educational concerns of our time can be confronted with educator involvement. Certainly the issues are not the sole responsibility of educators. But educators should be a central force in framing the educational solutions. Educators are not there now but they might be in a much stronger position if the collaborative proposals are pressed aggressively before many more legislative sessions move the locus of power further from the expertise of governing boards and educational leaders.

APPENDIX A

LISTING OF PARTNERSHIPS (1988)

National Center for Educational Renewal (NNER)
John I. Goodlad, Professor and Director
College of Education, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Partnerships

1. ARIZONA - Greater Tucson School-University Partnership
   College of Education
   University of Arizona
   Tucson, Arizona 85721

2. ARKANSAS - Arkansas Educational Renewal Consortium
   1201 MacAlmont
   P.O. Box 3017
   Little Rock, AR 72203

3. CALIFORNIA - Southern California Council of Educational Renewal
   Claremont Graduate School
   Claremont, California 91711

4. COLORADO - Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal
   574 W. 6th Ave.
   Denver, CO 80524

5. HAWAII - Hawaii School-University Partnership
   College of Education
   University of Hawaii
   1776 University Avenue
   Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

6. INDIANA - Indiana Public School-University Partnership
   902 West New York Street
   Indianapolis, Indiana 46233

7. MAINE - Southern Maine Partnership

Bailey Hall, College of Education
University of Southern Maine
Gorham, Maine 04038

8. MASSACHUSETTS - Coalition for School Improvement
University of Massachusetts
416 Hills North
Amherst, Massachusetts 01003

9. MICHIGAN - Michigan School-University Partnership
College of Education
Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-6680

10. NEW YORK -New York Network for Educational Renewal
Graduate School of Education
Fordham University
113 W. 60th Street
New York, New York 10023

11. UTAH - Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership
217-D McKay Building
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah 84602

12. VIRGINIA - Virginia School-University Partnership
Curry School of Education
University of Virginia
Ruffner Hall 405 Emmet Street
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

13. WASHINGTON - Puget Sound Education Consortium
Miller Hall
College of Education, DQ-12
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

14. WYOMING - Wyoming School-University Partnership
College of Education
University of Wyoming
Larimie, Wyoming 82071

APPENDIX B

STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

Name _____ State _____
Organization _____ Position _____
Date _____

1. General Awareness and Understanding of the Respondent in terms of the School-University Partnership Concept

2. What is it you see as the major problem or focus of your institution, school district, or state in the coming year? What goals, problems, or forces are driving your organization? (General)

Where are you now in dealing with these?

3. Where do you see the School-University partnership concept fitting into this focus or solution of these problems?

4. What do you see as the focus needed for teacher education (if a school person) or school district (if a higher education staff member)?

How well do you think these issues are being addressed (by the other party)?

5. Where do you see the partnership concept in terms of the thrust or needs for school districts or teacher education?

6. From your knowledge of the partnership efforts you have observed so far, are your needs and those of the teacher education unit (or school district) being met?

7. What has made the partnership concept helpful in addressing the common needs of the school district and institution of higher education?

8. What has hindered the partnership from being more of a factor in addressing the educational needs of the school district or university?

9. Dr. John Goodlad and others have felt that one of the keys to effective reform efforts might lie in the creativeness and energy set in motion by school districts and IHE coming together to address major educational issues. What comments would you have for Dr. Goodlad and others regarding the potential of the partnership concept? What will help the partnership make an impact?

10. Do you see other approaches that have a greater potential for facilitating change?

Other ideas - suggestions - comments

END NOTES

1. Goodlad, J.I. "Schooi-University Partnerships: An Idea Whose Time Has Come?" Unpublished manuscript. Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, undated.

2. National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk. Washington D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1983.

3. "Schools, Universities in 10 States Have Joined Goodlad's Network for Educational Renewal." *Education Week*. Washington D. C., Volume V, No. 32. April 30, 1986.

4. Goodlad, J.I. "The National Network for Educational Renewal." Unpublished manuscript. Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, March 1986.

5. Goodlad, J. I. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

6. Sirotnik, K. A. and Goodlad, J. I. School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1988.

7. Sirotnik, K.A. and Wentworth, M. "Tents By The Sea - Data Gathering and Evaluation." Unpublished manuscript. Center for Educational Renewal. University of Washington, undated.

8. "California Connection." *Partnership News*. Southern Maine Partnership Newsletter. Southern University of Maine, Spring 1988.

9. Goodlad, J. I. "School-University Partnerships: A Social Experiment." *Record* (Kappa Delta Pi), Spring 1988.

10. Untitled letter. Sent by John I. Goodlad to Calvin M. Frazier confirming the arrangements for the study of the partnerships. September 11, 1987.

11. "'Schools for 21st Century Project Is Taking Off." *Education Week*. Washington, D.C. , Volume VII, No. 39. June 22, 1988.

12. "3 States Must Trim Budgets in Wake of Revenue Shortfalls." *Education Week*. Washington, D. C., Volume VII, No. 38. June 15, 1988.

13. "Education bills abound, but new ideas few." *State Education Leader*. Education Commission of the States. Denver. Volume 7, No. 2, 1988.

14. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Carnegie Forum. May 1986.

15. From a speech given by Governor Rudy Perpich of Minnesota at an August 13, 1988 general session of the annual Education Commission of the States meeting in Baltimore, Maryland.

16. "Teachers' Unions Urge Members To Take Risks for Reform." *Education Week*. Washington, D.C., Vol. VII, No. 39. August 3, 1988.

17. *Radius*. New publication begun by the American Federation of Teachers. Two volumes out at time of this paper. AFT Center For Restructuring. AFT. Washington, D. C.

18. Re: Learning Project. Material describing this project can be obtained from the Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado.

19. Untitled Letter. Sent over the signature of Donald Kennedy, President of Stanford University, September 18, 1987. This was a summary of ideas agreed to by 37 college and university presidents meeting earlier at the Spring Hill Conference Center near Minneapolis, Minnesota. Letter is available from the American Association of Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C.

20. Untitled letter. Sent by Ed Meade of the Ford Foundation to Calvin M. Frazier in regard to Mr. Meade's thoughts regarding the scope of partnership efforts and their pattern of past problems. May 31, 1988.

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991